GOD,
THE
KING,
AND THE
COUNTREY,
United in the Justification of this
Present Revolution:
Containing also Animadversions on
Dr. William Sherlock's Book;
Intituled,
The Case of Allegiance Due to Soveraign Powers, stated and resolved, according to Scripture and Reason; and the Principles of the Church of England.

By *TIM. WILSON*, M. A. and Rector of *Great Mongeham* in *Kent*.

Licensed, *Jan.* 29. 1691.

LONDON, Printed for *Tho. Parkhurst* at the *Bible* and *Three Crowns* in *Cheapside* near *Mercers* Chapel. 1691.

GOD,

THE

KING,

AND THE

COUNTREY.

United in the Justification of this

Present Resolution:

Containing also Animadversions on

Dr. William Sherlock's Book;

Intituled,

The Case of Allegiance Due to Sovereign Powers, stated and resolved, according to Scripture and Reason; and the Principles of the Church of England.

By TIM. WILSON, M. A. and Rector of Great Mongeham in Kent.

Licensed, Jan. 29. 1691.

LONDON, Printed for Tho. Parkhurst at the Bible and Three Crowns in Cheapside near Mercers Chapel, 1691.

To the Sacred Majesties of King *William* and Queen *Mary*, by the Grace of God King and Queen of *England*, *Scotland*, *France* and *Ireland*, Defenders of the Faith, &c.

May it please Your Majesties,

THE *Divine Providence, that disposeth all things to the emolument and advantage of those that love God, hath sent Your Majesties to be our Saviours and Deliverers from Popery and Slavery, to the Joy of all sound Protestants, not wholly sunk and buried in prejudice. And we see the* Prophecy of Isaiah *fulfilled*, Kings shall be your Nursing Fathers, and Queens your Nursing Mothers. *But the Government of* Moses, *whom God sent into* Egypt *to deliver his people, was not without some Murmurers, and men of a revolting spirit, who looked back towards* Egypt. *Victorious* David *had that crafty* Politician, Achitophel, *his Adversary; and* Absolom, *who stole away the hearts of this people; and* Sheba, *a Mover of Sedition. The Reign of* Solomon *had some, who complained of Grievances and Oppressions, tho he honoured God by building a Magnificent Temple. The most excellent* Deborah, *tho she had some that jeoparded their lives unto death with her, yet she had others, who for their Divisions caused great thoughts of heart. It is my affection to the* Protestant *Cause, and Your Majesties* Government, *that moves me thus resolutely to rush into your Sacred* Presence. *I am very sensible that false* Principles *will create* Practices *correspondent to them: And therefore I have examined some new and strange Notions of Gods* Providence, *and Humane Governments of late asserted by some Doctors. To say,* That a Prince hath Gods Authority, tho' he hath no Humane and Legal Right, and that there is another Person, who hath Legal Right, is dismal to consider in the consequences thereof. *If this Poison creeps into the Church, I tremble to reflect upon the Effects of it. It is good for nothing but to produce Insincerity, and to make men swear to live peaceably, when*

they have War in their hearts. I am confident of Your Majesties Protection; for I have acted in this Affair with a full satisfaction of Conscience, and the greatest Evidence of Reason. And no History can exceed, if parallel, so great valour and courage, mixed with so much grace and clemency, as hath shined in King William. *This is to be like God, who is Almighty, and yet slow to wrath; whose Power is irresistible, and yet he delights in Mercy. Go on, and prosper, most victorious* Prince; *and may the God of Heaven bless you with success by Sea and Land against that proud and persecuting Monarch, who hath been the Ruine of so many Innocent* Protestants *in his own Dominions. May God give Your Majesties the Necks of your Enemies, and may they all tast of Your Forgiveness and Bounty, but never forsake Your first Friends, who ran all hazards with Your Majesty. I pray with* Tertullian, *who saith, We Christians pray for our Emperors; 1. That they may have a long Life; which contains Health, Joy and Prosperity. 2. A constant, safe and secure Government. 3. Faithful and Trusty Domestick Servants, free from Treachery, and secret Conspiracy. 4. A strong and valiant Army. 5. A faithful Senate, Council, or* Parliament. *6. Obedient, Submissive and Loyal People. 7. A quiet and peaceable Reign. In a word, whatsoever can be the desire of Cæsar.*

God inspire Your Majesties with heavenly Grace and Wisdom, and sound Knowledge, and good Understanding to go in and out before this great People; and moreover give you Victory, and Peace, and Length of Days; and at last may Angels convey Your Souls into Abraham's *bosom. This is the constant prayer of*

Your Maiesties

Most Humble, most Loyal, and most Devoted Subject and Servant,

Tim. Wilson.

The Apoſtle aſſerts in the 13th Chap. of the Epiſtle to the *Romans*, *That all Emperors, Kings, Princes and Governors, receive their Power from God. And that the Right of the Sword is delivered to the Magiſtrate by God. And therefore all are obliged to be ſubject to the Higher Powers, and not to reſiſt. And whoſoever reſiſteth the Power, reſiſteth the Ordinance of God, and ſhall receive damnation.*

FOR the right underſtanding whereof, I ſhall premiſe theſe Principles.

1. All Dominion is Gods.

2. God gives Dominion and Power to ſome perſons over others.

3. The Law of Nature (which is the Divine Law unwritten) is a Rule, by which all Nations ſhould walk.

4. This Law of Nature teacheth all Inferiours to honour their Superiours; and Subjects to pay Tribute, honorary Gifts, &c. to their Kings.

5. The ſame Law of Nature ſecures every mans Propriety; ſo that there can be no Alienation, without conſent, explicite, or implicite. There is (ſaith *Ariſtotle*, *Rhet. b.* 1. *c.* 13.) as all divine, by Nature a common juſt and unjuſt, though there be no mutual communication, nor compact.

6. The holy Scriptures do not contradict the Law of Nature, but inform mankind more plainly what is duty.

Laſtly; The ſacred Hiſtorian *Moſes*, and other holy Writers leave Poſitive and Political Laws to be practiſed according to the Uſage of ſeveral Countries.

I ſuppoſe (as the known truth is) that God Created *Adam* and *Eve*: And *Adam* begat *Cain* and *Abel*. Now what Land, or what ſubſtance and goods *Adam* gave *Abel*, he had Right to by the Law of Nature, as well as what he got by his own induſtry and labour. Neither could *Adam* or *Cain* take any of *Abels* Flock without ſinning againſt God, tho' there had been no Agreement between them. For this Law was written in *Adams* heart, *Thou ſhalt not covet any thing that is thy Neighbours*. There is a Natural Right, and there is a Civil Right: Natural Right is by the Law of Nature. *Meum* and *Tuum* were before there was any written Law. Civil Right is that which the Municipal Laws of every Countrey gives. And (if good, and conſonant to Reaſon) they are but confirmations, or explications of the Law of Nature, or concluſions drawn from it, or ſecurities of mens Lives, Goods and Poſſeſſions, from wicked men, who would uſe no conſcience. *We know* (ſaith St. *Paul*, 1 *Tim.* 1. 8, 9, 10.) *that the Law is good, if a man uſe it lawfully; knowing this, that the Law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawleſs and diſobedient*, &c.

Government as Government agreeth to Heathens, Jews, Turks and Christians, all alike. It is man as man who is the object thereof. The Nature, and Definition, and Properties are the same. The holy Scriptures intend not to teach us to be Politicians, no more than to be Philosophers; but to be Christians, and make us wise to salvation. The Law of Nature, or Right Reason, is the Rule of Political Government. And all Civil, or Municipal Laws, are to be squared by it, and so directed to the publick good, as their end.

But more particularly, for the illustration hereof,

1. I shall consider what Government is.
2. The several kinds thereof.
3. I shall shew the Latitude of Subjection.

1. I shall consider what Government is. Government is Power or Authority, which some men have over others, derived from God, and exercised according to Agreement, for the good of the whole Society.

In this Description, 1. We have the general Nature, Power or Authority.

2. The Author of Government; it is derived from God.

3. The formal Reason; it is exercised according to Agreement.

4. The End; for the good of the whole Society.

1. We have the general Nature, Power or Authority. Government generally considered, denotes superiority of Office and Authority. Where there is no Authority, there can be no Government, nor no Obedience or Subjection due. Power or Authority (saith *Camero*) is that whereby a person may claim any thing to himself without the injury of any other. Thus a Father exercises his Power, when he commands his Children: A Master over his Servants: And a King over his Subjects.

2. We have the Author of Government. It is derived from God. There is no Power but of God. All Dominion is Gods. *The Kingdom is the Lords*, (saith *David*) *and he is the Governour among the Nations. And the Lord hath prepared his Throne in the Heavens, and his Kingdom ruleth over all*, Psal. 22, 28. *and* 103. 19. *By me Kings reign, and Princes decree justice. By me Princes rule, and Nobles, even all the Judges of the Earth*, Prov. 8. 15, 16. God is the Absolute Monarch over all.

3. The Formal Reason, It is exercised according to Agreement. My Opinion is this; Government in general is of the Law of Nature; but in special, whether Monarchical Absolute, or Limited and Conditional; whether by Hereditary Succession, or by Election, is according to Positive, Humane Law and Compact. So that the People, or Fathers of Families were at liberty to chuse, what Form of Government they thought most convenient, and Fundamentally to fix the Constitution. Which may not be altered but by the same means or power. Thus Power in general is of God, as *Solomon*, and St. *Paul* say. But the Specification, Limitation,

Limitation, and first Designation of the Person, or Form is by Humane Right, or Positive Law, according to the Discretion of the Assembly of the People. And this seems to me evident by Scripture and Reason. Thus the Higher Powers are the Ordinance of God, saith St. *Paul*. And the Emperor is the Ordinance of Man, saith St. *Peter*. Mankind is naturally subject to none but God, or whom God shall appoint. But otherwise the Sons of *Adam* are left at Liberty to chuse what Person or Form of Government any free Multitude can agree upon. This Opinion seems consonant to the Doctrine and History of the Holy Scriptures; the constant Practice of the Kings of *Israel*, or rather the People of any Common-wealth, is consonant to the Principles of the Law of Nature; and is neither Erroneous in Divinity, nor dangerous in Policy. And experience sheweth that the best and most conscientious Subjects pay Obedience, according to the several Laws and Customs of their Countreys. The Epistle to the *Romans* was written either in the Reign of *Claudius Cæsar*, or of *Nero*. As for *Claudius*, Historians tell us that he hid himself, and the Souldiers proclaimed him Emperor, and both the Multitude, and the Senate agreed to his Election. And as for *Nero*, his *Quinquennium*, or first five years were admired by all, and had the approbation of the best Men, while he followed the Advice of *Seneca*, and other grave Counsellors. And tho' afterwards he proved a cruel Tyrant and Persecutor, yet the Laws and Customs of the *Roman* Empire in Civil things were good and just. And in those things of which St. *Paul* speaks, even *Nero*'s commands were to be obeyed Actively: As is plain, *For there is no Power but of God, and Rulers are not a terror to good Works, but to the evil, and he is the Minister of God to thee for good.* And therefore pay *Cæsar* his due, Tribute, Custom, Fear, Honour, or whatever the Laws of your Countrey and Conscience, and the Laws of God require of you, without Resistance: *For they that resist, shall receive to themselves Damnation.* And this is the Judgment of all the Famous School-men, either Ancient or Modern, whom I have either read, or look'd into. Insomuch that I stand amazed that this Doctrine should have no more Followers in *England*, when in all other Disputes our English Divines are the most rational Men in the World. But to use St. *Paul*'s words in another case, *I bear them record that they have a Zeal for Monarchy, but not according to Knowledge.* Yet let them know, that as far as I can find by search, it is the united Determination of all Politicians, School-men, and Divines, who purposely handle the Controversies, that tho' Prince and Subject are Relatives, yet (*prioritate rationis*, or *Ordine naturæ intendentis*, as Logicians speak) in nature and time Subjects were first instituted, and Princes were constituted for the Subjects sake on certain conditions, unless you follow the example of such as design'd Tyranny. From whence it follows, that Subjects were not Born for Kings, but Kings or Princes, and Governours ought to promote the profit of Subjects. I have

have as much reason as any of your Majesties Subjects to value your Service, Crown, Dignity, Honour, and Prosperity, and the Succession to your Heirs, yet I follow the old Maxim, *Malim veris offendere quàm placere adulando.* I think nothing becomes a Priest so much as Integrity. I am sure that no Man can deny, that the Apostle speaks of the Higher Powers commanding things lawful, or of the Civil Legal commands of the Higher Powers; and these must not be resisted. But they mistake, who think that this command of the Apostles was given to Christians to be obedient to *Nero* in his unlawful commands. Whereas the Apostles command in this place (saith a Learned Divine) reacheth to all times, and is made to all that are Christians: Tho' they did live under *Nero*, yet it doth not follow, that the Apostle commands them to be subject to him in Unlawfuls. If indeed *Nero*'s commands were only unlawful, and this Direction of the Apostle was made only to Christians in those times, and that subjection commanded were only suffering subjection, then this Scripture might make much more for Non-resistance. But tho' *Nero* was an Enemy to the Christians, yet some of his commands were lawful; and this Direction of the Apostle was not made only to Christians in those times, but as a general rule for all good Men. And the Obedience and Subjection here commanded, was not only to be Passive, but Active. This Scripture commands Active Obedience to the Higher Powers in all things which concern the Duty of Subjects, and the Publick Good.

And as for the Instances in Scripture out of the Books of the *Kings* and *Chronicles*, it is plain that there was a Covenant between the King and People. And after the Deposing of *Athaliah*, all the Congregation made a Covenant with the King in the House of God, 2 *Chron* 23. 3. And what doth a Covenant signifie, if it may not be defended and justified? If such a dead Dog as I am, were worthy to admonish an English Monarch, I would advise him to make Law the Rule of his Reign, and shew his Prerogative in Acts of Bounty, Mercy, and Mitigation of the Rigour of some severe Laws: And I would not tell him, that it is Rebellion for an Innocent Subject to defend himself. And yet I imagine that I am as great a Friend to Monarchy, and to the Church of *England*, as the greatest Passive-Obedience-Doctor is.

4. We have the End of Government, For the good of the whole Society. Power and Authority is ordained of God for the Happiness of Mankind. By this we are legally secured against wicked Men in our Houses, Possessions, Lands, and Estates; in our Liberties, and Properties, and in whatsoever belongs to us as Members of a Civil Society. Political Order is a just Disposition between King and Subject, as well as between Subject and Subject. God is the Author and Lover of Order; and an Enemy of Disorder and Confusion. And Government was constituted by the singular Wisdom and Providence of God for the good of his Creatures. From

From hence I may deduce theſe Inferences.

1. Hence the Power and Authority of Kings and Governours is clearly Divine. They are conſtituted Rulers by God, and are his Miniſters. And therefore Honour and Obedience is due to them for the Lords ſake, *1 Pet.* 2. 13.

2. Hence it follows evidently, That Princes and Governours ought to Rule in Gods fear, and ſo perform their Office as Gods Vicegerents, adminiſtring Juſtice impartially, knowing whoſe Authority they have. Hence Princes are called Paſtors of the People, and Fathers of the Countrey. And ſhould bear the Name of Gods, and Children of the moſt High, not only in Power, but in Goodneſs.

3. Hence it neceſſarily follows that all Subjects ought to reverence and honour their King and Governours with moſt humble Service, Homage, and Obedience in all things. But of this more anon.

2. I ſhall conſider the ſeveral kinds. The moſt common Diſtribution is into Monarchy, Ariſtocracy, and Democracy.

The firſt kind or Form of Government is Monarchy. I approve of this as beſt, according to the ſaying of the moſt Famous Poet, *The Rule of many is not good.* Let there be one Ruler, one King, to whom God gives the Scepter. He is King, who hath Supream Power, ſubject to none.

And a Monarch is either Abſolute, or Conditional. And again, either Elective, or Succeſſive. Elective, when in a Kingdom a Perſon of a new Family, or of the ſame Family is choſen. Succeſſive, when the next Heir, Male, and in ſome Kingdoms the Female, is owned and proclaimed. Thus the Kingdom of *England* is by Inheritance and Succeſſion: And our King never dies, as we ſay. But the King of *England* is not Abſolute, but Limited: And hath Lords, and Commons, without whom he cannot make, nor repeal Laws. And we have *Magna Charta* unviolable: And the Subjects great Felicity, and no leſs the Kings Honour, who Rules not over Slaves, but Freemen.

3. I ſhall ſhew the Latitude of Subjection. It is a Civil Filial Fear of the King: And excludes all things that tend to his Diſhonour, and includes all things that tend to his Honour. It contains all Duties and Services required of Subjects to their Prince. There is an univerſal Obedience (next under, and after God) in all things Legal due to the King, who Reigns by the Ordinance and Appointment of God. Native Religion and true Chriſtianity is the greateſt Intereſt of Princes. A good Conſcience and pious Heart abhors Obmurmurations, Factions, Seditions, Rebellions, or whatſoever can be conceived to diſturb the Souls ſubjection to the Higher Powers. It is groſs Hypocriſie to pretend to follow the Holy Jeſus, and not render to *Cæſar* the things which are *Cæſar's*. I am ſure that Chriſt and his Apoſtles taught Subjection to the *Roman* Emperor, as the Ornament and Honour of their Religion.

This Subjection, first, forbids light and vain thoughts of the Kings Authority and Person.

2. Uttering Wicked and Trayterous words; speaking evil of him. *Thou shalt not revile the Gods, nor curse the Ruler of thy People*, Exod. 22.28. *And curse not the King, no not in thy Thought*, Eccles. 10.20. And the Holy Ghost brands them with the odious name of *filthy Dreamers, who despise Dominion, and speak evil of Dignities*, St. *Jude*, *ver.* 8. In brief, It excludes all retaining of his Dues, Tribute, Custom, *&c.* all Cheating him of his Revenue; all Disobedience to his wholsom Laws; all Contempt or Violation offered to his Sacred Person.

2. Subjection includes or comprehends all Duties of a Christian Subject to his King. For that which is in one place, Let every Soul be subject to the Higher Powers, is in another, Fear the King, and Honour the King. And in the Fifth Commandment, Honour thy Father and Mother. Here as by Father and Mother all Superiors are meant; (not only our Natural Parents, but also our Political Father, our Governours, especially the Supream Magistrate, the King: As it is well explained in our Church-Catechism, To Honour and Obey the King, and all that are put in Authority under him: Which also is the Interpretation of all sober Divines.) So by this word Honour, all kinds of Duty and Services from all Inferiors to their Superiors respectively, are comprised. So to Honour, as to Fear, Love and Obey them, *&c.* This is expressed also by St. *Peter*, *Submit your selves unto every Ordinance of Man for the Lords sake, whether it be to the King as Supream, or unto Governours, as unto them that are sent by him, for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well*, This is yet more fully and largely set down by St. *Paul*, Rom. 13. Where this Doctrine is not only declared, but pressed and confirmed by many strong and solid Reasons. We must needs be subject not only for Wrath, but also for Conscience sake, *v.* 5. If you make Conscience of your ways, give the King his Due. There is nothing more plain than this Chapter for Subjection to the King, and Submission and respect to his Officers without murmuring and repining, when according to Law they demand their Dues. The humble Christian, and obedient Subject, who willingly submits to the Kings Laws, may be assured that in that particular he pleaseth God, and he always hath the Testimony and Satisfaction of a good Conscience. But the stubborn and disobedient, who will not render to *Cæsar* the things that are *Cæsar's*, assuredly displeaseth God, and can never quiet his Conscience; but runs the hazard of a most ignominious esteem in the World, and of Eternal Damnation in the World to come.

And verily Resisting Governours is not less unbecoming the Reason of a man, than the Patience and Humility of a Christian: For the Officer is armed with Authority, but the contumacious Opposer hath nothing to defend or plead for him, but Arbitrary Power, wilful Perverseness,

and

and ſtubborn Humour, which in cold blood or ſober conſideration muſt be acknowledged far more dangerous than the evil the Reſiſtant pretended to remedy.

And here if ye demand the manner of this Subjection: I anſwer, True Chriſtian Subjects bear to the King, ſuch a Submiſſion as Children to their Parents: Not a terrifying and amazing, but a reſpectful and reverential Subjection. The King is the Father of his Countrey, and all his Loving and Loyal Subjects are as ſo many Children to him.

This Subjection alſo doth imply, 1. A real and eminent Love of the King. Gods own People *Iſrael* ſaid of King *David*, *Thou art worth ten thouſand of us*, 2 *Sam.* 18. 3. Hence the King is called *The breath of our noſtrils*, *Lam.* 4. 20.

2. This Subjection doth imply Fidelity and adhering to the King at all times, and in all conditions. The King, and his Subjects, are united in their Political capacity, as the Head and the Body: Their welfare is conjoyned, and cannot be ſeparated. And this Fidelity is moſt excellent, when it comes from a touch of Gods finger; from the Grace of his holy Spirit. As we read there went with *Saul* a band of men, whoſe hearts God had touched, 1 *Sam.* 10. 26. But ſuch as clave not to him are ſtigmatized for Children of *Belial*, who deſpiſed their King, *v.* 27. For Fidelity alſo we have the example of *Davids* Servants; *Behold thy Servants are ready to do whatſoever my Lord the King ſhall appoint*, 2 Sam. 15. v. 15. *And* Ittai (that Loyal heart; that noble and conſtant ſpirit) *ſaid to the King* (when *David* went to perſwade him to go back, and to take care of his own ſafety) *As the Lord liveth, and as my Lord the King liveth, ſurely in what place my Lord the King ſhall be, whether in death or life, even there alſo will thy Servant be*; *v.* 21. Here was a faithful Servant and Loyal Subject indeed; and herein he evidenced himſelf no leſs obedient to the Law of God, by which we are bound in Conſcience to help the King againſt his Enemies. And thus to adhere to the King (by being faithful in the Truſt repoſed in us; in being juſt in our places, and ready to help in all difficulties) is a right and ſure way to make a Kingdom invincible and terrible to Enemies. Diviſions, Conſpiracies, and Combinations in a State, expoſe it to forreign Enemies. *A Kingdom divided againſt it ſelf cannot ſtand*, ſaith the wiſe Counſellor, the Son of God. But Unity of heart and affections between Subjects and their Sovereign, renders a Kingdom proſperous at home, and formidable abroad.

3. Prayer to God for him. Our Religion, the Law of our God, our Chriſtianity as well as our Fidelity, Loyalty and Affection, call for this at our hands. The bleſſed Apoſtle St. *Paul* exhorts *Timothy* to this duty, 1 *Tim.* 2. 1. &c. And I think that the Collects of our Church for the King and Queen, are both wiſe and Chriſtian.

4. Thankſgiving to God for any mercy to the King. *I exhort that Thankſgivings be made*, ſaith the Apoſtle. The Infinite Majeſty of Hea-

ven

ven is the Ocean, from which flow all blessings that we mortals receive. It is he that giveth great Deliverance to his King, and sheweth mercy to his Anointed, to *David*, and to his seed for evermore, *Psal.* 18. 49,50. Therefore should we give thanks unto the Lord, and sing praises to his holy Name. Especially let us praise God for the wonderful and happy Deliverance of this Church and Nation by our *Joshua*, who hath by the Divine favour and blessing saved us, and put a stop to the Malice and Cruelty of all the Churches Enemies. *This is the Lords doing, and it is marvelous in our eyes.* And as great a mercy as ever this Nation and Church enjoyed: Tho' through an unnatural Principle the Prejudices of many wise and pious men have made them ungrateful to your Majesties, who are in truth, Εὐεργέται, Benefactors, not only to all English Protestants, but to all the Reformed Churches.

And that these Prejudices may be removed, and that all your Subjects may give God, and your Majesties thanks, hath been my constant desire and labour. And tho' I know that the multitude are prone to Innovations and Changes, and too apt to be seduced, yet in this Revolution they are to be justified, so far as they defended their Religion, Laws and Liberties. And I challenge any learned and conscientious Divine to dispute the Case in Print before God and the World.

And therefore I humbly beg your Sacred Majesties pardon, while I make Animadversions on the Reverend Dr. *William Sherlocks* Book, intituled, *The Case of Allegiance due to Sovereign Powers, stated and resolved, according to Scripture and Reason, and the Principles of the Church of* England.

I cannot believe that false Principles in Government conduce to your Majesties service. And for this reason among others I think it my duty to oppose them.

I do believe that the Reverend Dr. acts according to the present perswasion of his Conscience, (as he speaks in the beginning of his Preface) and I do not take him either for a dishoneſt man, or a fool. But, as he saith, he may be mistaken, and so may any body else, tho' never so wise and honest. And he saith ingenuously, that if any man can shew him, that the Principles he acts on are false, uncertain, or precarious, and such as cannot reasonably satisfie an honest and unbiassed mind, he will confess that his desire of satisfaction secretly and insensibly distorted his Judgment, tho he took all possible care that it should not. I do, as I would be done by, and I believe that many have refused the Oaths upon Principles of Conscience, tho' I believe their Consciences erroneous. And I hope to make it evident, if, as the Dr's phrase is, they will deliver themselves from the Tyranny of Prepossession and Prejudice, § 2. p. 10.

Animadversion on Section 1.

The Dr. saith, *That which hath perplexed this Controversie, is the intermixing the Dispute of Right with the Duty of Obedience, or making the Legal Right*

Right of Princes to their Thrones the only Reason and Foundation of the Allegiance of Subjects.

A. I cannot imagine that any Obedience is due, but to him only who hath Right. If he hath no Right, why should I pay him Obedience? The Scripture saith, *Fear to whom fear, honour to whom honour.* I must know therefore to whom it is due. The Scripture supposeth all Subjects to know some other way, to whom Obedience, Fear and Honour is due. For I take it for granted, and as that which all Learned men will own, that the Scripture is not a Rule of Policy, or Political Government, any more than it is of Logick, Astronomy, or any part of Philosophy; which are Arts and Sciences of themselves. And so Policy hath Rules and Methods of its own, and depends upon the Sense and Reason of all Mankind, being not proper to Christians, but common to Jews, Turks or Heathens. And besides, the English Policy is not the same with other Christian Nations.

Now as to our present Government and Revolution, English-men may be divided into these three Ranks.

First; Such as joyned with the Prince of *Orange* before or at his Landing, according to his Declaration, Expectation, Desire, and Invitation of them.

Secondly; Such as did not joyn with the Prince of *Orange*, but did oppose him, either with their Prayers, or with their Strength, or with both; but since have taken the Oaths of Allegiance to King *William* and Queen *Mary*.

Thirdly; Such as did neither joyn with the Prince of *Orange*, nor since have taken the Oaths.

The Reverend Dr. is among the Moderate men of the second Rank: (And *est quiddam prodire tenus*: It is something to come thus far; we have the shorter way to our Journeys end, as one saith.) For he writes thus, *Many things are said (for the justifying the Legality of the late Revolution) which may make one much more moderate in the point than some are*, § 1. *p.* 2. And his endeavour is to perswade those of the third Rank to take the Oaths; (a very honest, charitable and pious endeavour) for he saith well in his Preface, *There are others who are still dissatisfied about the Oaths, and are desirous to try, whether they can find that satisfaction, which he hath done.* This, I confess, is a good Reason, which may in charity oblige me.

To proceed; All Learned men know what it is to suppose or put a Case, and I will not be a quarrelsom Antagonist; but will be as civil to the Dr. as he can be to me; and therefore for his supposition, I will not charge him with reflecting upon this present Government; which he saith, and I believe he speaks his conscience and heart, *he is very sure, he is far from intending to do, in the latter end of his Preface.*

The Dr. seems to make a contradistinction between Right, and Go-

vernment, in these words, § 1. p. 1. *Allegiance is due only to Right, not to Government, tho' it can be paid only to Government.* Now I think there can be no Government, where there is no Right: For who should command, and who should obey, where there is no Right to command? Otherwise how could there be such a thing as Anarchy, or Confusion, when every man doth what is good in his own Eyes, as when there was no King or Governour in *Israel? Judg.* 19. 1.

And again p. 2. *If then Allegiance be due, not for the sake of Legal Right, but Government.* But I say there is no Allegiance due, where there is no Legal Right: (either Natural or Positive;) for I suppose all Obligatory Laws founded upon Natural Principles. Again, the Dr. asserts, *That God placeth and setteth some Princes on the Throne, tho' they have no Legal or Humane Right,* p. 3. Now this seems to me a Riddle. I am of Opinion, that every Prince, who hath Gods Authority, hath a Legal and Humane Right; unless God immediately from Heaven by an Angel, or the like extraordinary way, gives him Authority. But no Prince ordinarily hath Gods Authority but by Legal and Humane Right; as will appear hereafter.

As for what the Dr. saith about the Disposal of Providence, it seems to me pure Enthusiasm, and the very Dregs of Quakerism; which I shall consider in due place.

Animadversions on § 2.

As for what the Dr. saith in this Section, and quotes out of Bishop *Overals* Convocation-Book, I admit and approve *sano sensu*, and I reverence their Authority: And I suppose that at that time there were some Divines, perhaps Bishops, in that Convocation, who did think Defensive Arms lawful in some cases, and founded Government in Agreement; as the ever-renowned Mr. *Hooker* and Dr. *Bilson* certainly did. And when the Dr. proves the contrary, I will believe him, and before, I suppose, he doth not desire that I should.

But let us see the Dr's. Inferences from the Doctrine of the Convocation. Men may dispute any thing, but I know not how it was possible for the Convocation to express their sense plainer; *That all Usurped Powers, when throughly setled, have Gods Authority, and must be obeyed.* So that here are two great Points determined, whereupon this whole Controversie turns.

1. That those Princes, who have no Legal Right to their Thrones, may yet have Gods Authority. But surely the Convocation meant, that they had a Legal Right, and were no longer Usurpers, when they had Gods Authority; as the King of *Egypt* and *Babylon*, and King *Alexander*, and the Emperors of *Rome*. Let him prove the contrary if he can. And I am fully of this Opinion, which, I think, is the Dr's. That there is *Momentum quod sic*, as the Schools call it, a Time, when all Usurpers, or Invading Powers have Gods Authority, and must be obeyed; and that is when they are throughly setled.

But

But the Question is, *When they are throughly setled?*

A. It is hard to determine and fix a time; but there is a time when Invaders and Conquerors have a Right and Title to the Crown. And I am of Opinion this is, When such a Prince and People have made a Covenant, Compact or Agreement, explicite or implicite: When having with a good Conscience defended their King, Laws, and Countrey, as long as they could, they yield, being taken Prisoners, or subdued. And let this consent be supposed to be over-awed, yet consent it is; especially when they have made a Solemn Promise or Oath to such a Prince. And he that breaks such a Promise or Oath is wicked. *David* describes a Citizen of *Zion* thus, *He that sweareth to his own hurt, and changeth not, Psal.* 15. 4. This is grounded upon this Natural Principle, That what Promise I make, if lawful, however inconvenient to me, I must perform.

By the way, I call an Explicite Covenant, when there is the Publick Consent and Profession of such an Ingagement made by a National Assembly.

I call an Implicite Covenant, when the Members of a Society in their Practice do all such Acts, as are required by the Rules agreed among them, and submit themselves thereunto: Tho' they make no verbal Promise or Profession thereof. I need not illustrate this in our Case; for all Men have seen with their Eyes, and heard with their Ears what hath been done among us.

Or, in the Drs words, § 2. p. 9. *The Government is throughly settled, when the whole Administration of the Government, and the whole Power of the Nation is in the Hands of the Prince, when every thing is done in his Name, and by his Authority, when the Estates of the Realm, and the great Body of the Nation have submitted to him, and those who will not submit, can be crushed by him, whenever he pleaseth:* If this be not a settled Government, I despair of ever knowing what it is.

Now I say, in plain English, This is a mutual Covenant between Governours, and Governed, and gives the Formality of Relation between King and Subject. But then in this Case the King hath an Humane and Legal Right, as well as Gods Authority; which the Dr. seems every where to deny. For he infers, pag. 5. *Therefore those Princes, who have no Legal Right, may have Gods Authority.* But I say, That tho' such Princes, as the Convocation speaks of, had no Legal Right before, yet when they are throughly settled, they have Legal Right. And this is the difference between the Dr. and me. And, pag. 9. The Submission of a Prince indeed may be thought necessary to transfer a Legal Right; but the Submission of the People, it self, is sufficient to settle the Government, and when it is settled, then it is the Authority of God, whatever the Humane Right be. See pag. 25, *&c.* He seems to assert, That no Right can be Legal and Humane, but Successive or Hereditary Right, § 4. p. 26.

I know Great, Learned, and Pious Authors, who are of this Opinion, as I have propoſed it; and the Dr. cannot appear ſingular in it, and to advance Paradoxes, as he ſpeaks, § 1. p. 3. to any Man who hath throughly ſtudied theſe Controverſies. But then all, or moſt of thoſe Divines, and Politicians aſſert Defenſive Arms in ſome Caſe: And that the ſeveral Forms of Regiment are according to Agreement, or an Ordinance of Man: And they uſually ſay, that the Call of the People is Eſſential to Magiſtracy in ſuch extraordinary Caſe: And ſo the Powers that are, are ordained of God, and muſt not be reſiſted.

Again, if the Dr. means, firſt, By Actual Poſſeſſion of the Throne, the Power of the Sword, or Strength, or the Princes being in *Whitehall*, and having the Royal Forts, *&c.* at his Command, then this alone cannot give Right, tho' it is the Diſpoſal of Providence. And this I take to be Hobbiſm, Scepticiſm, or Atheiſm. And ſuch things I have read in ſome Oliverian Pamphlets to juſtifie that Damnable Rebellion, as the Diſpoſal of Providence. And thus to ſay that Conqueſt, Election, and Uſurpation were all one to the Primitive Chriſtians, as ſome of late have ſaid, is moſt abominable, and to be exploded. And the Reverend Dr. verges ſo near this, that I wiſh he would explain himſelf better, if it be not his meaning. See § 4. p. 18. 'The Scripture hath given us no 'Direction in this Caſe, but to Submit and pay all Obedience of Subjects 'to the preſent Powers. It makes no Diſtinction, that ever I could find 'between a Rightful King and an Uſurper, *&c.*

A. The Scriptures, not being an abſolute Rule of Policy, as I ſaid before, ſuppoſe that we know, who is our King or Governour, or who are the Higher Powers, by Reaſon, and the ſeveral Laws and Conſtitutions, or Immemorial Uſages of ſeveral Countries. And then inſtruct Subjects in their Duty. But of this Section I ſhall ſpeak in its Order.

2. If the Dr. means by Actual Poſſeſſion of the Throne, ſuch a Covenant or Settlement, as is before mentioned, then I ſay, whoever hath ſuch a Settlement, hath not only Gods Authority, but Humane and Legal Right; tho' he is not the next Heir, or immediate Lineal Succeſſor. And of ſuch a Prince I grant, the Subjects need not inquire, *Quo jure, quâve injuriâ*, as the Schools ſpeak, he came to the Throne: or whether he had Reaſon to Invade, or Conquer, or not. He is King, and hath Gods Authority, and muſt be obeyed. And in this caſe the old Maxim proves true, *Vox Populi eſt Vox Dei*, The voice of the People is the voice of God. God chuſeth whom the People in this manner chuſe. But I do not think that any rational Politician, or judicious Divine grounds this Poſition upon the Diſpoſal of Providence firſtly: I am ſure, moſt do not.

But upon ſuch Principles as theſe;

1. No one Form of Government is Natural or Moral, but purely of Poſitive

Positive Agreement. And tho' it is good Manners in the Subjects of a Monarch, especially of an English Monarch, to believe Regal Government best; and to believe that Hereditary Government, or Monarchy, is most prudential and excellent: And that Lineal Succession is not to be altered but upon very sufficient grounds. And tho' no Man ought to meddle with them that are given to change; (which may possibly befall a King, as well as his Subjects) yet no Man can with a good Conscience condemn any other lawful Form of Government. As the Government of the Consuls, and Senate of *Rome* of old: Or the Government of the Duke of *Venice*, or Senate at present: Or the States General of the United Provinces. All whose Subjects are to obey, and not resist their several Sovereigns, by St. *Paul*'s command, *Rom.* 13. For they have their Power of God, and Gods Authority.

2. The Publick Good is the Sovereign Law of all. And so tho' Subjects have Sworn to maintain their Sovereign, yet if he, and they are Conquered, and the Conqueror gives them their Lives, Liberties, or Estates, whereupon they Promise or Swear Allegiance to him, they must for the future own him as their Soveraign Lord. Or, if they are grievously oppressed, so that the Publick Good of their Countrey or the Preservation of their Laws, Liberties, and Religion requires them to forsake their King, who (as I suppose) would have brought them into Slavery; or Non-assistance, as the Dr. confesseth, when a loving, valiant, and good Friend comes to save their Religion, Laws, and Properties. In this case the Subjects ought to obey him that hath Actual Possession of the Throne. For he is their Elected King, and hath Humane, Legal, and Divine Right.

And this secures Princes from Factious, Seditious, and Rebellious Subjects. And secures Subjects from Wicked, Cruel, and Ill-designing, or Ill-advised Princes, who follow evil Counsellors, to the Subversion of the Laws, and Ruine of the Kingdom.

And this I think may be proved from the Drs. own Assertions, scattered in this Book.

1. He asserts, p. 14. *Sometimes God not only places a single Person in the Throne, but intails it on his Family by Humane Laws, and makes the Throne a Legal Inheritance.* And p. 24. *Hereditary Right is either a continued Usurpation, which can give no Right, or a Right by Law, that is by the Consent of the People to intail the Crown on such a Family.* Now all Laws are made by the Advice and Consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons. From whence it follows that the Dr. must own, that Hereditary Monarchy is so made by the People; and that such a Monarch receives all his Power (for he hath no Power, but Legal) from them as well as from God. And as for what follows, *which*, saith the Dr. I observed before, *If Right be resolved into the Choice and Consent of the People, cannot be done; for what Right had my Ancestors three or four hundred years ago, to chuse a King for me?* A.

A. I am afraid the Dr. next time will say, That the Laws of former Parliaments, made some years ago, do not bind us, tho' not repealed. And none but present Parliaments can make Laws for us. We have nothing to do with our Forefathers; we must personally consent to all Laws. Phy! for shame Dr. let us hear no more of this. For I am confident you do not believe, that our Ancestors had no Right to make Laws for us, or to chuse a King for us. A King is a King to Children Born of Parents, who have chosen him, or his Family, and such Children are his Subjects without a personal and verbal Ingagement: And former Laws bind us without a new Act of Parliament to confirm them.

2. The Dr. asserts, p. 36. *If they* (that is, Sovereign Princes) *receive their Authority from Men,* (which they do, as well as from God, say we) *and Humane Laws,* (which the Dr. confessed before) *I cannot imagine that their Power is any more than a Trust, of which they must give an account to those who have intrusted them with it, according to those Laws, by which they were intrusted to exercise that Power. For whether there be any express Provision made in the Law to call them to an Account or no, the Nature of the thing proves, that if they receive their Power from Men, they are accountable to them. For those who give Power may take an Account of the use and abuse of it.* This, with the Drs. Concessions hereafter mentioned, proves the Lawfulness, Reasonableness, and Conscience of this present Revolution. And, p. 25. he saith, *A Legal Intail is nothing more than the Authority of the People.* So that the Authority of the People (I mean, either the Convention of Estates, which is an extraordinary Assembly, or the Parliament, which is the ordinary Assembly) gives Humane and Legal Right. And such a Prince is set upon the Throne by God, and is by the Disposal of Providence, and is Gods Minister for the good of the People. So that what the Dr. saith in the beginning of p. 25. is very weak, To say *that God sets up no Prince, who ascends the Throne without Humane Right and Legal,* is to say, that some Kings are removed, and others set up, but not by God; which is directly contradictory to Scripture; It is to say, That the Four Monarchies were not set up by God, because they all began by Violence and Usurpation; It is to say, That God, as well as Men, is confined by Humane Laws, in making Kings; It is to say, That the Right of Government is not derived from God, without the Consent of the People. For if God cannot make Kings without the People, or against their Consent declared by their Laws, the Authority must be derived from the People, not from God; or at least, if it be Gods Authority, yet God cannot give it himself without the People, nor otherwise than as they have directed him by their Laws.

A. If we speak of Gods Absolute Power, he can send a Legion of Angels, and set the Crown upon a Kings Head, or by any like extra-

ordinary

ordinary Nomination and Means. But we ſay (and I hope the Dr. upon conſideration will not deny it) that Right Reaſon, Natural Conſcience, Law, and Scripture are the Rule of our Duty; and by theſe means God cooperates, and his Divine Providence concurs with men. And when the Dr. is in his ſenſes, and argues like himſelf, that is, a Divine of his Reputation and Station in the Church, he will tell you, *p.* 65. *That the King hath no Right but by Law, and then the Law may determine how far his Right ſhall extend*, &c. But this Revolution hath confounded the wiſdom of the wiſe, and brought to nothing the underſtanding of the prudent; inſomuch that a man may propound St. *Pauls* Queſtion to theſe great Doctors of our Church; *Where is the Wiſe? Where is the Scribe? Where is the Diſputer of this World?* Hath not God made fooliſh the wiſdom of this World? It is much eaſier to juſtifie the whole Revolution. I will here add the Judgment of *Tol.* collected by the Author of the Synopſis on *Rom.* 13. Power (that is, Principality or Magiſtracy, yea, even of Infidels and Idolaters) is not but of God, that is, from the Divine Ordination and Diſpoſition, that the wicked may be reſtrained, the juſt honoured, *&c.* from God as the firſt Beginning, and Cauſe, and Author, not indeed by himſelf, but mediately, by men, in whom God hath put this inſtinct to ſet over them thoſe that ſhould Rule them. And whoever reads the Lord *Chan. Forteſcue*, will find this true in *England.*

Animadverſions on Sect. 3.

In this Section I ſhall animadvert on ſome of his Propoſitions; and then propoſe his Conceſſions, ſcattered all over his Book.

As for the two firſt Propoſitions, I admit them: But I think that I may juſtly find fault with the third, which is, *There are but three ways whereby God gives this Power and Authority to any perſon: Either by Nature, or by expreſs Nomination, or by the Diſpoſals of Providence.*

Here I ſay that this Diviſion is Illogical and naughty. Logicians ſay, that the parts of a Diviſion muſt be oppoſite; but theſe are not. For the Power and Authority, that is given by Nature, is the diſpoſal of Providence; and the Power and Authority, that is given by expreſs Nomination, is the diſpoſal of Providence alſo. And I muſt confeſs, that in my ſmall Reading, I never met with any that made ſuch a ſort of diviſion. I ſhould have added, 3. By Covenant, or by the Election of the People. I fear that the Dr's. Enthuſiaſtical notion of Providence here impoſed upon his Learning.

Let no man ſay, that I do not ſpeak of Divine Providence with that awful regard and reverence that I ought; for ſurely I juſtifie Gods Providence much more clearly, than this abſtruſe and unaccountable notion.

The Dr. goes on: *By Nature, Parents have a Natural Superiority over their Children, and are their Lords and Governours too.* This was the firſt Government in the World, and is the only Natural Authority: For in propriety

propriety of ſpeaking, there is no Natural Prince but a Father, &c.

Here obſerve that this deſtroys the Principles of Sir *R. F*'s. Book; with which ſo many young Divines in the Univerſity of late have been poſſeſſed, and about which they have been ſo very paſſionate, that they would endure no modeſt oppoſition; but invidiouſly declaimed againſt any man who did but call in queſtion this Principle, as if he could not be a Lover of Monarchy. If there is no Natural Prince but a Father, thens in propriety of ſpeaking, there can be no Natural Prince now in the World; but every Prince muſt be by Inſtitution, or Agreement, or the like. For the Relation of King and Subject are not Natural, as the Relation of Father and Child are. But yet I ſay, Monarchy approacheth neareſt to the Government of Gods Throne. And I approve of the words of the Reverend Dr. *Fern*, Monarchy (however we cannot ſay it is *Jure Divino*, by Divine Precept, commanding all Nations, to be ſo governed, or *Jure Naturæ*, by Nature's Law inforcing it) is plainly *ductu Naturæ*, by Nature leading men from Paternal to Legal Government, and *exemplo Divino*, as I may ſay, by Divine example and inſinuation. We ſuppoſe (as the Sacred Hiſtorian tells us) that *Adam*, and ſo *Noah* after the Flood, by Gods bleſſing begat Sons and Daughters. Theſe ſpread over the face of the Earth; ſome in *Aſia*; ſome in *Africa*; ſome in *Europe*, &c. And theſe God indued with Reaſon, and they lived (or ſhould have lived) by the Light of Nature, Gods own Law written in their hearts. (And as face anſwereth to face in a glaſs; ſo the heart of man to man.) And when they encreaſed greatly, for orders ſake, or becauſe ſome were lawleſs, and, living without the fear of God, oppreſſed the weak, Natural Prudence, which is the Light of God in Man, taught them to Covenant with one Ruler, and to have common ſociety and mutual help, and ſome Rules, Laws and Cuſtoms to determine Controverſies between Family and Family; Man or Man for the publick good. To this firſt Conſtitution all were bound, both Rulers, and Ruled; and this could not be changed (ordinarily) but by the Heads of ſuch Societies, or Families. If any man can diſprove this by Reaſon, or Scripture, we would gladly ſee it.

As for our own Countrey, it is manifeſt in the moſt antient Hiſtories and Chronicles that ever I read, that we have been governed by Kings all along. But we have had an Heptarchy, and not always Lineal Succeſſion. And when *England* was one Monarchy under *Egbert*, in the year of Chriſt 818. or thereabouts, we ſhall find the Succeſſion altered for the publick good; as the late Author of the *Unreaſonableneſs of Separation* upon the account of the Oaths hath largely ſhewed out of *Mat. Weſtminſter*, and *Mat. Paris*, and others. But ſtill all this ſuppoſeth an Agreement between the King and People originally. And no doubt Monarchy, and all Government will ſtand beſt upon its own Foundation. And what men agree to, all conſcientious men will obſerve, according

to

to the mutual Oath of King and People. And it is so far from being an inconvenience, that it is the only true and just Title of all Royal Families. And it is a prejudice to the King, to say otherwise: For the best and wisest men submit only upon Condition and Covenant. We know that Nature teacheth all men to prevent Ruine; and this is the Law of God.

But let us come to the Dr's. great Principle, the disposal of Providence, *p.* 12. *God governs the rest of the World, removes Kings, and sets up Kings, only by his Providence, that is, then God sets up a King, when by his Providence he advanceth him to the Throne (that is, I think, God sets up a King, when he sets up a King*; a self-evident Principle*) and puts the Sovereign Authority into his hands: Then he removeth a King, when by his Providence he thrusts him from his Throne, and takes the Government out of his hands*, &c.

I can make no other sense of this, but that God doth it, when he doth it. But how shall it appear to us, that it is Gods Providence, either to remove, or set up a King?

The Dr. answereth, *There are but three ways whereby God gives this Power and Authority to any person; either by Nature, or by expres's Nomination, or by the Disposal of Providence, p.* 11. If this be not Trifling, I know not what is. If any man should ask the Dr. Who made him Master of the *Temple?* and he should answer, God made him so, or it was the disposal of Providence; would he not smile, tho' this is true? But the Question asked is about the Humane Principal Efficient, subordinate to God, and his Providence. But the former never comes into question among Christians. It is confessed, it was Gods Providence that exalted *Joseph* and all Kings. I can hardly forbear, but I have always reverenced the Dr. and therefore will say no more, but Lord have mercy upon us the sinful Sons of *Adam*: O the power of Prejudice!

As for Gods Providence in this Revolution, I have published my thoughts in a Discourse entituled, *Conscience satisfied, in a Cordial and Loyal Submission to the present Government of King* William *and Queen* Mary; and I must refer the inquisitive Reader to that Treatise, *p.* 11, *&c.*

But here farther, that we may consider what the Doctor saith, we must distinguish of Gods Providence: *It is either*, 1. *Immediate and extraordinary*; *Or* 2. *Mediate and ordinary.*

1. The immediate and extraordinary Providence of God is, when God works what he will besides or against the means and order appointed by himself in Nature. And this is done in all Miracles, which are effected to this end, that we may know that the Omnipotent Creator and Governour of all things, acts most freely by means, or without means.

And this is manifest either, 1. In punishing his Enemies: Or, 2. In preserving his Servants. Thus God immediately by a Deluge from Heaven drowned the Old World; confounded the Language of the Rebels

at *Babel*; rained Fire and Brimſtone out of Heaven upon *Sodom*; drowned *Pharaoh* and his Hoſt in the Red Sea, after all thoſe former Plagues and Judgments upon him. Thus God commanded the Earth to open and ſwallow up thoſe proud and hypocritical Rebels, *Corah* and his company. By this the Sun ſtood ſtill, and the Moon ſtayed, till the people had avenged themſelves on their Enemies, *Joſh.* 10. 13. By this, to deliver good *Hezekiah* and his people *Iſrael*, the Angel of the Lord ſmote in the Camp of the *Aſſyrians* one hundred fourſcore and five thouſand, 2 *King.* 19. 35. On the other ſide, God by his extraordinary Providence gave *Abraham* a Son in his old age; commanded the Ravens to feed his zealous Servant *Elijah*; multiplied the Widdows Oil; and preſerved the three Children in the Fiery Furnace, and the like. Hence the Pſalmiſt concludes; *The Lord alone doth great wonders*, *Pſal.* 136. 4.

But I ſuppoſe the Dr. doth not mean, that God makes any King or Queen thus by Miracle. He did not ſend an Angel to ſet the Crown on their Majeſties Heads on the days of their Arrival in *London*, or on the day of their Election by the Convention of Eſtates, or on the day of their Coronation.

2. Therefore there is a mediate and ordinary Providence of God: And that is, when God by Creatures or ſecond Cauſes produceth thoſe Effects, to which thoſe Creatures or Cauſes by the conſtant, accuſtomed Order of Nature are appointed and made by God. Thus by food and nouriſhment he ſuſtains us; by Phyſick and Medicines he removes diſeaſes, and heals the ſick; by his Word Read and Preached he declares his will to ſinners, and perſwades them to believe and obey. Thus we read, *Man doth not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord*, *Deut.* 8. 3. And *Hezekiah* was recovered by applying a lump of Figs, and laying it for a Plaiſter upon a Boyl, *Iſa.* 38. 21. Finally, thus our Saviour ſaith, *Abraham* in the Parable told the rich Glutton, *They have* Moſes *and the Prophets, let them hear them*, *Luk.* 16. 29. Thus I acknowledge it is the diſpoſal of Providence, that by the Convention of Eſtates, as Means or Inſtruments, the Prince and Princeſs of *Orange* ſhould be King and Queen of *England*, *&c.*

Now the Dr. ſaith well, § 3. *p.* 12. *Providence is Gods Government of the World by an Inviſible Influence and Power*, &c. But he might have told us, that the Acts, Manner, and Effects of Providence become viſible to us.

And the diſpoſals of Providence are ſeen, either, 1. In Divine Judgments or Puniſhments.

Or, 2. In Divine Probations, and Fatherly Corrections and Chaſtiſements.

Or, 3. In Divine Bleſſings, Mercies, and Deliverances: And all theſe are Perſonal, Domeſtical, or National.

Now Gods Providence is holy and juſt in all theſe. But ſometimes the Inſtruments are very wicked. Thus proud and cruel men, who break

break in pieces Gods people, and afflict his Heritage, as the Pſalmiſt ſpeaks; tho' they are Gods Rod, or Inſtruments by whom the Lord chaſtiſeth his Servants (which in God is moſt lawful and juſt) I ſay, ungodly men are guilty of the evil of ſin: Becauſe they propound to themſelves the ſatisfaction of their own malicious and ſpiteful affections. But whoever are the Inſtruments of Gods Providence in Bleſſings, Mercies, Deliverances, in ſuch Acts do well, and deſerve praiſe of all that are not ungrateful. Thus the late Revolution is Gods juſt Judgment and Puniſhment on the Papiſts, and all Oppreſſors that joyned with them. But it is an exceeding great mercy, bleſſing, and deliverance to the Proteſtant Church, and all Gods faithful Servants. But I ſpare the Dr's prejudice. He knows the old ſaying, *Dolus latet in generalibus.* God permits evil Inſtruments, but he approves good Inſtruments in ſuch acts.

It is true alſo as the Dr. ſaith, *That God not only permits, but he doth theſe things. He permits men to do wickedly, but God is the Author of all the Good and Evil, which happens to private perſons, or publick Societies. Surely no Chriſtian doubts of this.*

But then we diſtinguiſh, which the Dr. doth not, and ſay, 1. Evil is from God, who puniſheth, corrects, or chaſtiſeth his Church.

2. Good is from God, who defends, delivers, bleſſes, or ſaves his Church. And this is done ordinarily by the free Miniſtries of men.

And the Queſtion between us is, of theſe Inſtruments, whether they be Evil, or Good, or whether they have done Evil or Good, deſerve well or ill of the Church and Common-wealth?

Thus to illuſtrate my meaning: I ſay, that *O. C.* and his Confederates were Uſurpers, Traitors and Murderers; and tho' they had power or ſtrength, yet they had not Power or Authority from God. But King *William* and his Confederates had not only Strength or Power, but alſo had Power or Authority from God to ſave this Church and Kingdom, when we were ſo near ſinking under Popery and Slavery. And this I think is deducible from what the Dr. ſometimes grants. As when he ſaith, *p.* 28. *The Law of God and Nature muſt take place of all Humane Poſitive Laws and Oaths.* And when he ſaith, *p.* 33. *Tho' I have as great a Reverence for Princes as any man, I do not think the Right and Intereſt of Princes ſo conſiderable as the Safety and Preſervation of a Nation, and the Lives and Fortunes of all his Subjects.* From whence I infer, that no Poſitive Laws, Oaths, or Prince, in caſe of ſuch Oppreſſions as we groaned under, ought to ſtand in competition with the Preſervation of our Countrey, Liberty, Property and Religion. And conſequently King *William* and his Confederates deſerve Immortal Honour from all Engliſhmen and good Proteſtants. And if this be not ſound Divinity, I deſire that the Dr. would be pleaſed to beſtow ſome of his Charity upon me, and write another Book to convince thoſe of my Perſwaſion. I wiſh he had free leave given him to try his skill. For tho' I do not pretend

to his Learning and Abilities, (and I know that he can teach me many things) nor have I the Opportunity of ſuch Libraries, and Converſation of moſt Judicious Men, yet I have ſtudied this Controverſie, and I never acted in any Affair with a more full and clear Approbation of my own Conſcience than in this Revolution: Or, to uſe the Dr's words in the beginning of his Preface, This I am ſure of, that I never acted with more ſincerity in any Affair of my whole Life, than I have done in this matter, from the beginning to the end; and whether I have ſufficient Reaſon for what I do, I refer to the Tryal of this, and other my Diſcourſes.

But in ſhort, All Power is of God, and all Power is of the People. All preſervation is of God, and all Preſervation is of our ſelves. All Riches and Honour are of God, and all Riches and Honour are of our ſelves, by our own Induſtry, and good Merit. For tho' we can Merit nothing at Gods Hands, yet we may Merit from Man. Thus, the Hand of the diligent maketh rich, ſaith *Solomon*, and the bleſſing of the Lord maketh rich. And ſeeſt thou a Man that is diligent in his buſineſs? he ſhall ſtand before Kings; he ſhall not ſtand before mean Men. This is Gods Cooperation and Concourſe: And God (*quaſi ex pacto coobligat ſe creaturis*, as a Learned Proteſtant Schoolman and Metaphyſician ſpeaks) by Covenant obligeth himſelf with the Creatures, and as it were promiſeth that he will help their Acts. And I ſuppoſe the Dr. himſelf doth not imbrace the previous efficacious motion mentioned by the ſtrict Followers of St. *Thomas*, and of *Calvin*.

Thus God removes Kings, and ſets up Kings. And this the Dr. will acknowledge, when he recovers himſelf. For he ſaith, p. 13. *Sometimes* [*a Prince is placed on the Throne by God, and receives his Authority*] *by the Election of the People; ſometimes by Conqueſt*; (*which hath been the viſible Original of moſt Governments*) (True ſay I; but Conqueſt makes a Man a Priſoner, not a Subject, till after Conſent and Agreement) *and when any Family is thus advanced to the Throne, it is continued by Succeſſion and Legal Entails*. But all theſe ways, or any other that can be thought of, are governed and determined by Divine Providence, and the Prince thus advanced is as truely placed in the Throne by God, as if he had been expreſly nominated, *&c.*

But the Secret or Reaſon of the Drs. obſcurity and confuſion, I believe, is this, He could not condemn the Inſtruments of Gods Providence in this Revolution, out of fear: And he could not juſtifie them, becauſe of his Erroneous Conſcience and Prejudice. And ſo he runs on with a General and Confuſed Diſcourſe of the Diſpoſals of Providence. Juſt as a Quaker, when he knows not what to ſay, will tell you, It is the Light within him that tells him it is ſo as he ſaith. So theſe Men will tell you, that it is Gods Providence: which is very true of all Acts, Means, and Events, good, or evil. But we deſire that Mens Conſci-

ences

ences ſhould be ſatisfied, whether the Inſtruments have done well, or ill. But the Dr. will not meddle with this.

Let us go on. Propoſ. 4. *All Kings* (ſaith the Dr.) *are equally rightful with reſpect to God: for thoſe are all rightful Kings, who are placed in the Throne by God, and it is impoſſible there ſhould be a wrong King, unleſs a Man could make himſelf King, whether God will or no,* &c.

A. I take this to be obſcure, and Enthuſiaſtical. Thoſe are all rightful Kings who are placed in the Throne by God, ſaith the Dr. True; but how ſhall I know that they are placed in the Throne by God? I ſuppoſe the Dr. will anſwer, When they are throughly Settled in the Throne, as § 2. p. 9. But then ſay I, This is the Election of the People, and ſuppoſes a Covenant, Explicite, or Implicite, as before. And this gives Humane and Legal Right. If the Dr. thinks otherwiſe, I deſire to know of him; for he is ſo cautious, that I cannot poſitively ſay: Sometimes he hath words to this ſenſe; ſometimes not.

And, I think, it is an odd ſentence to ſay, It is impoſſible there ſhould be a wrong King, unleſs a Man could make himſelf King, whether God will or no, &c. For God may permit a Man to call himſelf King, who is not King, and his deluded Followers may flatter themſelves, and him alſo: As the late D. of *M.* was called King at *Lyme*. But God never approved of him as King; which I ſuppoſe the Dr. will acknowledge; and yet this was the Diſpoſal of Providence. Let the Dr. diſtinguiſh here, and then he will have an anſwer. And I am of Opinion, that if the P. of *O.* had called Himſelf King, when he entered *Exeter*, or when he marched on without much, if any oppoſition towards *London*, or when he had Poſſeſſion of St. *James*'s, or *Whitehall*, all Engliſhmen had been bound in Conſcience to oppoſe Him, as an Invader of the Liberty of their Countrey. But when by their Repreſentatives they Elected Him King, then all the Duties of Subjects were to be paid to Him. And if I had ten Thouſand Millions of Lives to loſe, I would venture them for this Propoſition, That Law is, or ought to be a Rule to all Men: And that if the King himſelf will go about to deſtroy all Laws, that the Subjects may defend themſelves. And when the Dr. anſwers the Arguments that I have brought in this, and ſome other Diſcourſes by me publiſhed, I ſhall think my ſelf bound to recant. But of this when I come to *Rom.* 13. in the next Sect.

At preſent, I will propoſe a few ſhort Queſtions, and Anſwers.

Q. *How doth it appear that a Prince hath Gods Authority, or that he is ſet upon the Throne by the Diſpoſal of Providence?*

A. When he hath Actual Poſſeſſion of the Throne.

Q. *When hath a Prince Actual Poſſeſſion of the Throne?*

A. When he is throughly Settled in his Throne, p. 9.

Q. *When is his Government throughly Setled?*

A. When

A. When the whole Administration of the Government, and the whole Power of the Nation is in the Hands of the Prince, *&c. ibid.*

Now this last Answer is intelligible and plain. And thus whosoever hath Gods Authority or Power, hath it mediately by the Election of the People, or by Covenant, Compact, and Consent, or Submission, which is an Implicite Covenant; and this is the Disposal of Providence.

But to begin at the Disposal of Providence, is to speak in the Clouds, and never to give a Rational account, either of the Original, Changes, or Revolutions of Government. In all my Discourse I suppose not only that God is, but that he hath made us with true Faculties; and so we are Reasonable Creatures, and can give a Rational Account.

I proceed to Propos. 5. The Distinction then between a King *de jure*, and a King *de facto*, relates only to Humane Laws, which bind the Subject, but are not necessary Rules and Measures of Divine Providence. In an Hereditary Kingdom, he is a rightful King, who hath by Succession a Legal Right to the Crown: And he who hath Possession of the Crown, without a Legal Right, is a King *de facto*, that is, is King, but not by Law, *&c.*

A. I imagine that this Distinction of a King *de jure*, and a King *de facto*, was invented for another purpose; and hath nothing to do in our Controversie. When the Houses of *York* and *Lancaster* laid Claim to the Crown, both by Inheritance and Lineal Succession, the Subjects being in great Perplexity, and many in very great Doubts, Scruples, and Uncertainties, who was the Lineal Successor, it was thought fit to make this Law. He that pretended to Lineal Succession, and had it not, was called a King *de facto*. He that had Lineal Succession was called a King *de jure*, tho' out of Possession. But if I were to distinguish in Reason and Conscience, as to our Case, I would distinguish thus.

A King *de jure* is Twofold; either, First, A King by Inheritance. Or, Secondly, A King by Election, tho' he is not the next immediate Heir, nor pretends to be. But in this I humbly submit to the Learned and Judicious Lawyers.

As for the rest of this Proposition, it is of the same piece with other Prejudices of the Dr's, and must have its Answer accordingly. See my other Discourses. And most of this Section is of the same Nature. The Dr. talks many times of a King having Gods Authority, without Legal Authority. Let him explain, and prove what he saith. For I know no Prince that hath Gods Authority, who hath not Legal Authority. When he would clear himself of Hobbism, (of which I believe he is not guilty) he saith well, Power, and nothing else, doth not give Right to Dominion, p. 15. But presently after, he seems to write Enthusiastically, and not like a Man guided by Reason, and Principles of Nature.

I come

I come now to his Conceſſions. Firſt, *It is evident*, (ſaith the Dr. § 4. p. 23.) *there is no Natural Authority but Paternal, and Patriarchal Authority.* This deſtroys Sir *R. F*'s Principle; and it concerns his hot-headed Followers to conſider it, as I obſerved before. But what the Dr. ſaith immediately after, is more than I can approve of, *That Monarchies were erected upon the Ruins or great Diminution of it*, &c. For I do not think Monarchy the Ruin or Diminution of Fatherly Authority, but rather the way to preſerve it, and add Perfection to it in the Increaſe of the World. The Dr. might have expreſſed himſelf more warily. For this ſeems to reflect more upon Monarchy, than the Subjects of a King ought.

2. Hear what he grants, § 4. p. 25. ſpeaking of thoſe who refuſe the Oaths, *If they would examine themſelves for what Reaſon they believe that a King who hath no Right to the Throne, is not ſet up by God, and inveſted with his Authority, they will find, That it muſt ultimately reſolve it ſelf into the Authority of the People to make Kings, which it is unjuſt for God himſelf to over-rule and alter*: (*pace tanti viri*, by the Dr's leave, I ſhould ſay, it is not Gods uſual Method and ordinary Providence to over-rule and alter) for a Legal Entail is nothing more than the Authority of the People: And if the People have ſuch an uncontroulable Authority in making Kings, (hold a little, the People cannot do this, when they have Covenanted, ordinarily, but in extream neceſſity) I doubt they will challenge as much Authority to unmake them to. But perhaps the Dr. will ſay, This is *Argumentum ad homines*; and I would not willingly miſrepreſent him. As for his Anſwer to the Objection, which I find, p. 26. I know not what to make of it, it is pure Enthuſiaſm, I think: I cannot meaſure it by any Rules of Reaſon.

3. He grants very honeſtly, p. 27. *That when ever a People have a good King*, (as ſurely, ſay I, King *William* and Queen *Mary* are a good King and Queen) *it is both their Duty and Intereſt to defend Him: And if they be not miſled by the Cunning and Artifice of ill Men, they will certainly do ſo.* But if they have a very bad one, that notoriouſly violates their Rights, and breaks the Conſtitution upon which Himſelf ſtands, and ſtrikes at the deareſt things they have, their Religion Eſtabliſhed by Law, and their Properties, I doubt the Caſe may be altered. And tho' every Body will not ſpeak it out, yet moſt may ſay in their Hearts, Let him go, if he cannot defend Himſelf. It is enough in Conſcience patiently to bear ſo bad a Prince, but a little too much to venture their Lives and Fortunes to keep him in the Throne to oppreſs them. This is againſt Reaſon and Nature, and I know no Law of God which requires it, *&c.* I wiſh with all my heart that this Conſideration, and other Arguments of the Dr's. may prevail with the moſt Reverend Father in God, the late Arch-Biſhop, and the Right Reverend the Biſhops, who have not taken the Oaths to their preſent Majeſties, I believe, out of pure Conſcience, tho' erro-

neous,

neous, and full of prejudice. And I have often wondered, that ſo many of the Clergy, who but a little before did ſo violently oppoſe the Prince of *Orange*'s proceedings (out of the like conſcientious prejudice, as I believe) did on a ſudden take the Oaths. This ſeems to me, to ſhew that our Caſe wanted but a little conſideration, and men might eaſily lay aſide their prejudices, in ſo bleſſed and deſirable a Change.

4. The Dr. grants, *p.* 28. *That the Laws of God and Nature muſt take place of all Humane Poſitive Laws and Oaths.* Hence I infer, that the Dr. cannot deny Self-preſervation.

5. He grants, *p.* 29. *That it is unreaſonable to expound the Oath to ſuch a ſenſe, as no man would have taken it in had it been expreſſed: No, no man in his wits would take it for the beſt Prince that ever ſwayed the Scepter.* Then ſuch an Oath, or Promiſe, or Declaration, could not intend to de-deſtroy Self-preſervation, Liberty, and Property.

6. The Dr. grants, *p.* 30. *We are not bound to defend the King againſt Law, or when he ſubverts the Laws, and Liberties, and the Legal Eſtabliſhed Religion of the Kingdom, by Illegal Methods:* Or, as he ſaith preſently after, *by the exerciſe of an Illegal and Arbitrary Power.*

7. He ſaith, *p.* 32. *Certainly this was not the Intention of the Oath, to fight for their King againſt their Countrey.* For an Oath to fight for the King, doth not oblige us to fight againſt our Countrey, which is as unnatural, as to fight againſt our King.

8. He owns the preſervation of the whole Kingdom is before the Prince, *p.* 33. in theſe words; *Tho' I have as great a Reverence for Princes as any man, I do not think the Right and Intereſt of any Prince ſo conſiderable, as the Safety and Preſervation of the Nation, and the Lives and Fortunes of all his Subjects.* I am ſure, we, who are for Defenſive Arms, cannot ſay more than this.

9. I leave the Teachers of Paſſive Obedience and Non-Reſiſtance to anſwer his Arguments, *p.* 36. or elſe I hope they will take the Oaths. I have ſpoken my thoughts of this matter. As for Biſhop *Overals* Convocation-Book, I do not love many words, I have ſpoken my mind.

10. This ſeems very hard, that when God hath actually delivered us, we muſt refuſe our deliverance, *p.* 38. And I add, it ſeems very hard that the Clergy, who receive moſt benefit by this deliverance, (if in heart they love the Proteſtant Religion) ſhould not honour the Deliverers.

11. The Dr. agrees to what Biſhop *Sanderſon* tells us, *That the End of Civil Government, and of that Obedience which is due to it, is the Safety and Tranquillity of Humane Societies; and therefore whatever is neceſſary and uſeful to this End, becomes our Duty: for the End preſcribes the Means.* Hence I infer the lawfulneſs of Defenſive Arms in ſome caſe; becauſe Humane Societies under a Tyrannical Prince, who Rules Arbitrarily, cannot be ſafe. I beſeech the Dr. ſeriouſly to conſider this, and examine throughly whether it doth not neceſſarily follow.

And

And before I end this Section, I muſt deſire the Dr. to reconcile ſome of his Aſſertions.

He ſaith, *p.* 4. *The Church of* England *hath been very careful to inſtruct her Children in their duty to Princes; to obey their Laws, and ſubmit to their Power, and not to reſiſt, tho' very injuriouſly oppreſſed; and thoſe who renounce theſe Principles, renounce the Doctrine of the Church of* England. But ſhe hath withal taught, *That all Sovereign Princes receive their Power and Authority from God; and therefore every Prince, who is ſetled in the Throne, is to be obeyed and reverenced as Gods Miniſter, and not to be reſiſted,* &c.

And here I obſerve that the Dr. chargeth the Non-ſwearing Biſhops, as well as thoſe who joyned with the Prince of *Orange*, as rejecting the Doctrine of the Church of *England*. Well; let the Dr. and his Party be the only true Church of *England-men*, if he can diſprove what I have now and elſewhere ſaid. He grants, *That whoſoever is ſetled in the Throne, hath Gods Authority, and muſt not be reſiſted.* But *p.* 25, 26. in anſwering an Objection, That this makes the Prince loſe his Right by being notoriouſly injured, *&c.* he tells us, *The Providence of God removes Kings, and ſets up Kings, but alters no Legal Rights, nor forbids thoſe who are diſpoſſeſſed of them, to recover their Right when they can,* &c. *and doth not diveſt the diſpoſſeſſed Prince of his Legal Right and Claim, nor forbid him to endeavour to recover his Throne, nor forbid thoſe who are under no Obligation to the Prince in Poſſeſſion, to aſſiſt the diſpoſſeſſed Prince to recover his Legal Right,* &c. *nor hinder him from Claiming it, when he finds his opportunity.*

I would here know of the Dr. who they are that are under no Obligation to the Prince in Poſſeſſion, and ſo may aſſiſt the diſpoſſeſſed Prince? Are they Domeſtick Subjects, or Forreign Enemies? What? may the late King with a good Conſcience invade *England* with an Army of French-men to recover that which the Dr. calls his Legal Right? I believe the Dr. to be an honeſt man, and that he hath no Plot or Deſign; but let him ſee the tendency of his Argument.

I ſhould anſwer the Objection thus; The diſpoſſeſſed Prince is either good, or evil. If he is a good Prince, and hath not oppreſſed his Subjects, his caſe is hard, and very calamitous, and much to be pitied; but he muſt ſubmit to Divine Providence, and Gods Fatherly Correction or Probation. And this is a difficulty in Providence, as the Dr's. phraſe is; according to the account of all Philoſphers, *Cur bonis malè?* But if his Subjects have ſtood by him with their Lives and Fortunes, and are conquered, and have ſeeled the Government of the Conqueror, either by a General Aſſembly, or by Univerſal Submiſſion, Promiſe, Oath, *&c.* they are excuſable, and the King ſo forced into Baniſhment, in Conſcience cannot require their Allegiance. If the Prince be evil, and hath oppreſſed his Subjects in a high meaſure,

then he forfeiteth his Legal Right, and it is transferred on another King for the publick good. But I pray God this may never befal the Royal Family again, while the Sun and Moon endureth. But surely the Nobility, Gentry, Clergy and Commons had Reason and Conscience to defend themselves against the Tyranny of Jesuits, and other evil Counsellors, who tempted the King to be ungrateful, and seek the Ruine of their Religion and Properties.

Again, *p.* 14. The Dr. saith, *He who hath Possession of the Crown without a Legal Right*, (that is, as he means, a Successive Right) *is a King* de facto, that is, *is King, but not by Law.* And yet *p.* 63. he saith, *The Law requires us to own him for our Sovereign.* Let the Dr. reconcile this.

Animadversions on Section 4.

I have before answered the Dr's Observation, *That the Scripture hath given us no Direction in this case, but to submit, and pay all Obedience of Subjects unto the present Powers.* It makes no distinction, that ever I could find, between a Rightful King, and an Usurper, between a King whom we must, and whom we must not obey. See Animadversions on Sect. 2.

And now I come to that famous Text of *Rom.* 13. And here the Reverend Dr. still owns Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance. And he tells us in his Preface, *That he hath renounced no Principle that ever he taught, except one in the case of Resistance, p.* 128, &c. which is the only material passage he knows any reason to retract in that Book, to wit, that when St. *Paul* saith, *All Power is of God*, he meaneth only Legal Powers.

Now I think the Dr. hath had the ill Fortune to adhere to one of the worst Principles, and renounce one of the best Principles, that ever he taught in Government.

And that I may prove this, it must come to my Turn to suppose. And here I shall premise the Dr's Words in the end of his Preface, *They who understand what belongs to Disputes of this nature, know very well that the shortest way to bring the matter to an Issue, is to put the Case at the worst that can be supposed; because this gives so much greater force and advantage to the Argument, when it is suited to those, who are most strongly prejudiced* [*against the Lawfulness of Defensive Arms in any Case.*]

In managing this Argument, (as the Dr. goes on) *it is necessary to reason upon supposition of the most Illegal and greatest Oppressions: And it may be I may meet with some Readers, as may charge me for so doing, with unchristian Behaviour, and clownish Irreverence towards a calamitous Prince, which I am very sure, I am far from intending to do.* I say, as I said at first, Sacred Majesty

Majeſty laid in the duſt requires our Tears: Our Religion, and our Laws revived require our Joy. This premiſed, I offer a Suppoſition.

Suppoſe the Late King was reſolved to Rule by a Standing Army: Suppoſe he had Suſpended all the Biſhops, as well as the Biſhop of *London*: Suppoſe he had turned all the Nobility out of their Freeholds, as well as the Preſident, and Fellows of *Magdalen* Colledge: Suppoſe he had ſet up an Illegal High Commiſſion Court: Suppoſe he had Tryed all the Miniſters in *England* for their Lives, as well as the Seven Innocent Biſhops: Suppoſe he had Cloſeted all the Nobility, as well as he did many, to over-awe their Votes in Parliament: Suppoſe he had given Power to all the Diſſenters, and Sectaries to preach in our Pulpits, as well as in private Meetings: Suppoſe all the Members of his Privy Council had been Jeſuits, and Bigotted Papiſts, as well as Father *Petre*, *Tyrconnel*, &c. Suppoſe he had Suſpended all the Clergy in *England* for not Reading the Illegal Declaration in Churches: Suppoſe he had commanded the Officers of his Standing Army to Plunder our Houſes, and cut our Throats. And now I think that I have almoſt ſuppoſed the worſt that I can ſuppoſe: And verily I tremble to ſuppoſe this. I will make but one Suppoſition more. Suppoſe that by teaching this Doctrine of Non-reſiſtance the Late King might be tempted to bring in his Religion by theſe Illegal and Horrid means: And thereby not only loſe his Crown and Dignity, but hazard the Damnation of his Soul, without Repentance, yet the Authors Doctrine is, *Subjects muſt not reſiſt*. And he ſaith, *Chriſt, and his Apoſtles, eſpecially St.* Paul *in* Rom. 13. *taught this Doctrine, when he ſaith*, Whoſoever therefore reſiſteth the Power, reſiſteth the Ordinance of God, and they that reſiſt ſhall receive to themſelves Damnation. No doubt but this is very edifying Doctrine. This was moſt irreſiſtible Rhetorick to the Senate, and People of *Rome* (the freeſt People of the World) to turn Chriſtians. For then, tho' their Philoſophers taught them, that they might defend themſelves againſt Tyrants by the Law of Nature, yet, they muſt not defend the Liberties of their Countrey: If they do, they muſt never be happy hereafter. This is an invincible Argument to any Jealous *Roman*, or Wiſe *Grecian*, to imbrace Chriſtianity. Is not this Doctrine againſt all Gods Attributes, his Goodneſs, his Juſtice, his Mercy, as well as the Predeſtinarian Doctrine is ſaid to be? What! hath God left his poor innocent Creatures, I mean Legally innocent, to be a prey to Lions? *Credat Judæus Apella, non ego.* And here I may uſe the Dr's words, (for I confeſs my ſtile is not ſo Elegant) p. 40. According to theſe Principles Humane Societies in ſuch Revolutions (I muſt ſay Male-Adminiſtrations) cannot be preſerved without ſin: For if all Men did their Duty, they muſt all be de-

ſtroyed. Now, I believe it will be hard to perſwade any conſidering Men, that that which in ſuch a Caſe is neceſſary to preſerve a Nation, is a ſin: And that which will infallibly deſtroy it, is a Duty and Virtue: If we allow the Safety and Preſervation of Humane Societies, to be the great Law of all. And I will add the Dr's words, §11. p. 3. *mutatis mutandis*, The Doctrine of Reſiſtance in ſome Caſe may ſtartle ſome Men at firſt, before they have well conſidered it. But every one at firſt ſight muſt acknowledge, that it is ſo much for the Eaſe and Safety of Subjects in all Male-Adminiſtrations and Univerſal Oppreſſion, (which ſometimes happen) what the Generality of Mankind, from an inward Principle of Self-preſervation, have always done, and will always do, that they have reaſon to wiſh it to be true, and to be glad to ſee it well proved. And p. 18. Theſe Principles are ſo very uſeful, eſpecially in all Innovations in Church, or State, that Subjects have great Reaſon to wiſh them true, and to examine over again thoſe ſtrict Principles of Loyalty, which if purſued to their juſt Conſequence, muſt unavoidably in ſome Junctures, Sacrifice whole Kingdoms, at leaſt all Subjects, who pretend to this degree and kind of Loyalty and Conſcience, to the Tyranny of Evil Counſellors, or Male-Adminiſtration of their Prince. And once more I will borrow the Dr's words, p. 44. (for I cannot uſe ſo good) Since then ſuch Male-Adminiſtrations will happen, ſuch Principles as muſt diſſolve Humane Society, when ſuch Male-Adminiſtration happens, or expoſe the moſt innocent and conſciencious Men to the greateſt Sufferings, without ſerving any good end by them, cannot be true: For the End of Government is the Preſervation of Humane Societies, and therefore that can be no good Principle of Government, which in the greateſt Male-Adminiſtration, if purſued, muſt Ruin the moſt excellent, true, and harmleſs Subjects, who deſire nothing but to live according to Law, and ſave their Liberties, conveyed to them by their Anceſtors. Paſſive Obedience in ſuch Caſe is to make all Mankind the Slaves and Properties of Princes: As if all Men were made for Princes, not Princes for the Government of Men, p. 45.

I know not but that a Barbarous and Savage Prince, as *Tyberius*, of whom it is ſaid, That there paſſed no day, no not ſo much as any Feſtival and Religious Holy-day, without the Execution and Puniſhment of ſome. Or as *Caligula*, who being highly diſpleaſed upon a time with the multitude, *Would to God* (quoth he) *that the People of* Rome *had but one Neck*, meaning to chop them off at one blow: And ſaid, *Let them hate me, ſo they fear me.* Or as *Nero*, who is reported to ſay, *Let the whole Earth be on Fire, while I live.* I ſay ſuch cruel Tyrants may poſſibly be well pleaſed with the Doctrine

ctrine of Non-reſiſtance. But ſurely no good and wiſe Prince, who would have the Affections of his Subjects, doth deſire that ſuch Doctrine ſhould be taught. The Great and Noble Spirit of *Auguſtus Cæſar*, or the Courage and Valour, together with the Clemency and Mercy of a *Veſpaſian*, or the Impartial Adminiſtration of Juſtice in a *Trajan*, would deteſt and loath ſuch a ſottiſh, brutiſh, and unnatural Principle. And nothing can make a Prince incourage it, but a Deſign upon his People, or to reduce them to Popery and Slavery, or to Rule Tyrannically, that is, both Wickedly, and Uneaſily. St. *Paul* himſelf ſtood upon his Priviledge againſt the Magiſtrate, *Acts 16. 37.* Paul *ſaid unto them, They have beaten us openly uncondemned, being* Romans, *and have caſt us into Priſon, and now do they thruſt us out privily? Nay verily, but let them come themſelves, and fetch us out.* It is a moſt excellent and prevailing Motive for the Saviour of Mankind, and his choſen Apoſtles, to uſe, to tell them, that if they will be his Diſciples, in ſome Caſe they muſt become Slaves. If they ſave their Countrey, and defend themſelves againſt Violence and Oppreſſion, (which they cannot but do, as Senſible and Reaſonable Creatures) they are certainly Damned. This verily is to become Fools that they may be wiſe to Salvation, in another Senſe than St. *Paul* meant it.

And now let us hear what the Dr. ſaith to us about *Rom.* 13. *To ſay the Apoſtle here ſpeaketh of Lawful Powers, is* gratis dictum, *for there is no Evidence of it.*

A. There is Evidence of it; and the Evidence or Reaſon of it, is this; Neither God, nor Man gives Authority to any man to oppreſs the Innocent. Therefore the Innocent in reſiſting Illegal proceedings, reſiſt no Authority; Nor do no evil, forbidden by God, or Man. See my Anſwer to the Hiſtory of Paſſive Obedience, in the beginning.

But, ſaith the Dr. *The Criticiſm between* Ἐξουσία *and* Δύναμις *will not do; for they both ſignifie the ſame thing in Scripture, either Force and Power, or Authority.*

A. Some Paſſive-Obedience men think this unanſwerable: But ſurely the Dr. cannot think the Divines of our Perſwaſion ſo weak, as to lay the ſtrength of the Argument upon a Word or Criticiſm. But firſt they give a Reaſon, as before, and then to illuſtrate their Argument, uſe the words, as Modern Criticks ſay, they are moſt commonly uſed in our days. The Apoſtle doth not ſay, *All Power,* Δύναμις, that is, Strength is of God; but *All Power,* Ἐξουσία, that is, Authority, or Lawful Power, is of God; implying, that it is not he that is the ſtrongeſt man, hath Gods Authority, as Mr. *Hobbs* ſaith; neither hath any Oppreſſor in the Act of Oppreſſion; neither are we required

required not to reſiſt ſuch Acts of Oppreſſion. But I obſerve however, that he ſaith not a word to thoſe Criticks, who ſay, that αἱ ὖσαι ἐξουσίαι, *The Powers that be*, that is, the True (or Lawful) Powers. But I would not have the Dr. think, that our Divines lay the ſtreſs of ſo great a cauſe upon Criticiſms; but they may be plain Illuſtrations.

The Dr. goes on, *p.* 19. *Why ſhould we think the Apoſtle here intends a diſtinction unknown to Scripture? Had there been any ſuch Rule before given, To ſubmit to Lawful Powers, but not to ſubmit to Uſurpers, there had been ſome pretence for underſtanding St.* Paul's All Powers, *of all Legal Power; but there being nothing like this any where elſe in Scripture, if he had intended any ſuch diſtinction, he ought to have ſaid it in expreſs words, or elſe no body could reaſonably have underſtood him to intend this Precept of ſubjection to the Higher Powers, only of the Powers that had Legal Right.*

A. St. *Paul* was not bound, neither was he ſent to teach the *Romans* Political Government, but he ſuppoſeth them to know this by the Cuſtoms of their Countrey, and he tells them, They muſt ſubmit, and not reſiſt; for *all Power is of God.* Chriſtians, as well as Heathens, or Jews, muſt obey Authority. But he doth not ſay, that Uſurped Power or Strength is of God, and to be ſubmitted to. And though the Dr. ſaith, *There is nothing like this any where elſe in Scripture, which is* gratis dictum, yet other Learned Divines ſay, that the Apoſtle means this, 1 *Pet.* 2. 13, 14. When he ſaith, *Submit your ſelves to every Ordinance of Man for the Lords ſake, whether to the King as Supream.* Hence they collect, and I think truly, That the Donation of the Power is of God, and the Deſignation of the Perſon, or Limitation and Qualification of the Power is of Man, tho' it is alſo the diſpoſal of Providence. I have ſaid in another Diſcourſe, God and Man in theſe Acts are not oppoſite, but ſubordinate. God is the firſt Cauſe; Man is the ſecond Cauſe. The Prince that receives Authority from Man, receives it from God alſo, tho' mediately by Man; and is Gods Miniſter and a Ruler, *v.* 3, 4.

The Dr. proceeds; *Then in order to the fulfilling of this Precept, it would be neceſſary for Subjects to examine the Titles of Princes, and to that end to be well ſkill'd in Hiſtory, and the Laws of a Nation, and to be able to judge between a pretended and real Right,* &c.

A. And ſurely it is not ſo difficult a thing to know who is our Prince, as the Dr. would make it. It is ſo eaſie, that every Subject in *England*, as far as ever I heard, never doubted that the late King *James* was the lawful King of *England*, *&c.* And there needs no great skill in Hiſtory and Law to know this. And as for the Revolution, when we are bound in Conſcience to obey another King, there needs no Hiſtory to tell us, what we have ſeen and heard. And the Reverend Dr. will tell us,

us, when the Government is ſetled, *p.* 9. Suppoſe the greateſt uncertainty that you can ſuppoſe, the Conſciences of men would not be more perplexed, than you have perplexed them at this day: And therefore you need not have ſaid, *Let any man judge in what perplexities this ſenſe of the Apoſtles Precept would involve the Conſciences of men.*

The Dr. hath a great deal more to the ſame purpoſe, and deſcants at large. To which I anſwer in general, That if St. *Paul* had taught us Politicks in *Rom.* 13. I ſhould have thought it very ſtrange. Men muſt learn Politicks from the Laws of Reaſon, and the common Prudence and Experience of Mankind.

Suppoſe the Great Turk in a Paſſion, or upon a ſmall Provocation, ſhould draw his Scymeter or Sword, to kill ſome Eminent Nobleman of his Court, and the Nobleman ſhould defend his Life by force of Arms, and by Skill or Strength ſhould diſarm his great Lord and Maſter, and eſcape for his Life. In this caſe I ſay, Natural Religion and Conſcience will juſtifie the Innocent Nobleman, and will tell the Great Turk, that he ought to give God thanks in ſuch like words as *David* did, when *Abigail* by her wiſdom pacified his wrath, 1 *Sam.* 25. 32. *Bleſſed be the Lord God, who ſent thee this day to meet me; And bleſſed be thy advice, and bleſſed be thou, who haſt kept me this day from ſhedding blood.* I ſhould never read the Scriptures, nor any Hiſtory or Law-book, to tell me, who is my King, no more than I would to tell me, who is my Father and Mother. I like a Fool have all my days preſumed without Book, with my Fellow-ſubjects, and with my Brethren and Siſters, who is my King, and who is my Father and Mother; and have honoured and obeyed them according to the fifth Commandment. Such reaſoning is unworthy of the profound Judgment of Dr. *Sherlock*. If the Dr. pleaſeth, I would deſire him to write a Book to teach Children what are their Names, and who are their God-fathers and God-mothers, before we Catechize them any more. For, is it not a very hard thing to know all theſe things? See how prejudice blinds the Eyes of pious and wiſe men.

I confeſs, that when there is a competition for the Crown, or when Impoſture may be reaſonably ſuſpected, or in the like extraordinary caſe, then the Subjects may become Sceptics. But then we have a Privy Council, and a Parliament, to examine, judge, and determine. But otherwiſe, I am perſwaded that there was not one of ten thouſand, that ever doubted, whether King *Charles* the Second was the true Heir, and rightful King, or King *James* the Second.

But let us hear the Dr's. Objection, *p.* 24. *If the choice and conſent of the People makes a Prince, then no man is a Subject, but he who conſents to be ſo; For the major Vote cannot include my conſent, unleſs I pleaſe: That is the Effect of Law and Compact, or Force, not of Nature. If Subjects give*

their

their Prince Authority, they may take it away again, if they please. There can be no Irresistible Authority derived from the People: For if Authority be wholly derived from them, who shall hinder them from taking it away when they see fit? Upon these Principles, there can be no Hereditary Monarchy: One Generation can only chuse for themselves; their Posterity have as much right to chuse as they had.

A. The Dr. owns, That if the Lineal Succession should fail, then the People must chuse a Prince; and this hinders not Hereditary Monarchy. No more doth it in such an extraordinary case as our present case is. And the Dr. himself saith, *p.* 25. *A Legal Entail is nothing more than the Authority of the People*; tho' here he saith, *Upon these Principles there can be no Hereditary Monarchy.* Let him reconcile these. The Parliament hath setled the Succession.

But, saith the Dr. *Every Subject must consent.*

This is thought a mighty *Goliath*, but I think it a poor, weak Argument. I have elsewhere shewed, that the meek, wise, and ever-renowned *Hooker*, foundeth all Government in Covenant, so that I am not singular in the Church of *England.* And surely it is not required in our Constitution, that every individual person consent explicitly to Acts of Parliament, but the major Vote includes all. And there is nothing more common in the World, either in Political, or Sacred Affairs, than for a Father, or Guardian, or God-father, or Friend, or Relation, to engage for a Child. See *Deut.* 29, 10, 11. If it were any other person, I should be afraid, would turn Anabaptist, or at least a Puritan, and write a Book against God-fathers. In these Cases an Implicite Covenant is fully sufficient. If the whole Kingdom consists of such who were Children to their Parents, that Elected the Prince, and agreed that the Kingdom should be Hereditary, this in Conscience binds them: Tho' they make no Personal and Vocal Expression of their Consent and Agreement, as the Fathers did. I imagine that upon second Thoughts the Dr. will have no mind to oppose this, and therefore I say no more.

But the Dr. saith, *That if Subjects give their Prince Authority, then they may take it away again, if they please.*

A. All Subjects are bound in Conscience to stand to their Covenant, Agreement, Promise, and Oath. And here whosoever resisteth the Power, resisteth the Ordinance of God, and they that resist shall receive to themselves Damnation. This is Rebellion, supposing a Kingdom not universally oppressed. And this secures the Prince, as well as the Providence of God, in the Dr's unintelligible Notion.

'But this is to say, God, as well as Man, is confined to Humane Laws 'in making Kings, p. 25.

A. I

A. I ſuppoſe the Dr. living among ſuch an Honourable Society of Lawyers, hath heard of being tryed by God and the Countrey: And ſo the King and Queen may be made by God and the Countrey. God feeds us, but we muſt put Meat in our Mouths. God Clothes us, but we muſt put on our Clothes. God doth what we do, when we uſe the Means appointed by God. And when the Dr. is in a reaſoning Humour, he will tell us, that there is no doubt but ſeveral Governments have been begun by, and Originally derived from the Choice and Conſent of the People, p. 23. but ſtill it is God, who by his Providence advanceth Men to the Throne. But of this before.

As for thoſe who advance Conqueſt, I have ſpoken my Mind formerly. And I add, that when the whole Community, be it by the Sword, is ſubdued, (as the Jews were by *Ceſar*) and have promiſed Subjection, and own the Authority of the Conqueror, and he promiſeth them Protection, I grant this gives the Conqueror Humane Right and Title, as well as Gods Authority. For he holds his Crown (as ſome ſpeak) *jure Gentium & conceſſu Gentium.* But if the P. of *O.* did Conquer *England*, againſt which he declared, and acted nothing like a Conqueror in any part of the Nation, where his Army Marched, but every where like a Saviour and Deliverer. I ſay, if the P. of *O.* did Conquer the Nation, the Princeſs of *Orange* did not. And Queen *Maries* Title can be no other way (God ſave Her Majeſty, for I am Her moſt Loyal Subject and Servant) but by the Election of the People in Convention, and now confirmed by Act of Parliament: Which I deſire all Conſcientious Men to conſider.

Finally, As for Submiſſion, that is an Implicite Covenant, as I have ſhewed, and muſt be kept. So that (tho' the Dr. cannot, yet with all, or the moſt Judicious Philoſophers, Schoolmen, and Reformed Divines) I can ſee where to fix the Foundation of Government, and that is in the Agreement of the People: And this is the ordinary Diſpoſal of Providence. But let it be by the Election and Conſent of the People: Or by Conqueſt, and ſo by After-Covenant: Or by Submiſſion, which is an Implicite After-Covenant: Or by continued Uſurpation, as the Dr. ſpeaks, which ſtill is founded upon After-Covenant and Promiſe, all theſe are the Diſpoſals of Providence. So that the Dr. very weakly (for I do not believe he doth it craftily) gives only the General Cauſe, which no Man denies. But we deſire to know, what is (*cauſa ſecunda, proxima, & particularis*) the ſecond, next, and particular Cauſe (as the Schools ſpeak) of this Revolution and Government.

And the Reaſon is, either we have done very well, or very ill

in joining with the P. of *O.* And we would gladly convince the Dr. or any Man elſe, that we have hazarded all that is dear to Man, Virtuouſly and Honourably, to preſerve Gods true Religion and Worſhip as by Law Eſtabliſhed, to ſave the Engliſh Monarchy from the Uſurpations of the Biſhop of *Rome*; and to continue the Liberties of our Native Countrey.

The Providence of God is no Rule, or Reaſon, or Meaſure of our Duty: But the Law of God and Nature, and the Laws of the Land, when they contradict not theſe. And the Dr. will tell us ſo, when he thinks of it, p. 32. The Divine Providence hath Ways and Methods of removing Kings and Setting up Kings, which we are not aware of, nor concern'd to know, becauſe it is no part of our Duty.

To ſum up all this, In this Revolution ſome talk of Deſertion and Abdication: Some of Conqueſt: Some of Gods Providence, as the Dr. and ſome of the Election of the People.

1. As to Deſertion and Abdication, whether the Late King did in a proper and ſtrict ſenſe Abdicate the Kingdom is a matter that I need not diſpute, but ſurely the Convention did well to take this into Conſideration, that the Kingdom was left without any Order or Government, in a very troubleſom time. But ſuppoſing that it was a proper and ſtrict Abdication, this doth not make the Prince and Princeſs of *Orange*, King and Queen of *England*. This muſt be ſome other way.

2. As to Conqueſt. And, 3. As to Gods Providence, I have ſaid enough to ſatisfie any Conſciencious, and wiſe Man, who will lay aſide Prejudice and Prepoſſeſſion.

And therefore, 4. I am fully ſatisfied in my own Conſcience, and will diſpute the Caſe with any Learned and Conſciencious Divine, that it can be juſtified no other way, but by the Election of the People in Convention.

As for the Examples of *Jehoiada*, and *Joaſh*, and *Athaliah*, and of *Jeroboam*, and *Jehu*, I think there may be a better Account given, than the Dr. gives: But this is nothing to the main Controverſie between him, and us. That concerns the Non-Swearers.

I ſhall only give you a familiar Simile or Example out of Scripture of the Election of a King, tho' it doth not *quadrare in omnibus*; it is not (nor needs be) fitted in all Circumſtances to the Kingdom of *England*.

In the firſt Book of *Sam.* chap. 8. The People of *Iſrael* deſire a King. (Then it follows, they had none before.) Whereupon *Samuel* told them his Meſſage from God, and at laſt yielded to the Importunity of the People. And he called all the People, *Chap.* 10. that is, All the Heads,

Heads, Elders, and Princes of the People; a great Convention, Parliament, or Assembly of the Nation. And they chose *Saul*. And all the People shouted, and said, *God save the King*. And those whose Hearts God had touched went with him. And they that despised him, were called Children of *Belial*. And I shall only add *Samuel*'s Admonition and Counsel, *Chap.* 12. *ver.* 24, 25. *Only fear the Lord, and serve him in truth with all your heart: for consider how great things he hath done for you. But if ye shall still do wickedly, ye shall be consumed, both ye and your King.*

I know that there are two Prejudices (as the Dr. speaks in like case) rather than Objections against this Truth.

1. This will not please the King, and Royal Family.
2. This occasions Subjects to Rebel, when they think fit.

1. This will not please the King, and Royal Family.

A. We are confident that this is an Insinuation of weak Spirits, and directly contrary to the Great and Heroick Designs of their Sacred Majesties, and their Impartial Administrations of Justice; and God forbid we should do any thing justly meriting the loss of Their Majesties Favour, and their Hearts confiding in us. I am sure that the pleading for our Liberties, is no Prejudice to the Kings Crown, or Prerogatives. Why should not our Soveraign look upon us with Respect, when we pay him all Legal Obedience out of Conscience, and venture our Lives and Fortunes in defence of his Crown and Dignity, as well as of our Laws, and Properties? Why may not we hope for Preferment, Honour, and Commendation, as well as those who never practise what they teach? When I have lived to see their Senses too much for their singular Divinity. But however we fare in this World, I am of Opinion, that a King should do Justice, a Priest should teach Truth, and a Souldier should Fight for a good Cause, and leave the Success to God. The Happiness of a Kingdom is in a Princes Ruling as a Father, and Subjects obeying out of Love, rather than meer necessity.

Obj. 2. *This occasions Subjects to Rebel, when they think fit.*

To this I say, besides what I have formerly written, that the Doctrine of Non-Assistance, which is now become common, is as bad, if not worse than our Doctrine of Resistance in some Case. Now the Dr. owns the former, p. 50. saying, *Thus far I think the Subjects may be very guiltless, who do not drive the King away, but only suffer him quietly (to be driven away, or) to escape out of his Kingdom: for this is no Rebellion, no Resistance, but only Non-assistance, which may be very innocent: For there are some Cases, wherein Subjects are not bound to assist their Prince, and if ever there were such a Case this is it.*

I grant Non-Assistance and Resistance are not the same in all cases: I grant we are not bound to assist our King in Illegal Commands: But I should think, that if we may not resist him in his Illegal and Arbitrary Commands, we ought in Conscience to assist him in his Legal

Commands, especially in the preservation of his Person, Crown and Dignity. And I am sure that the late King would have called this a Seditious and Rebellious Doctrine, as well as ours. But thus the poor King was cheated. And the Dr. may say, as well as think in his heart, *p.* 27. *Let him go, if he cannot defend himself.* Well; I commend the Dr. in this case, for Teaching Subjects to sleep in a whole skin. But in troth I think, it is more plain dealing, and the King had better be told, that in the same case they will not assist him, they will resist, that is, in case of Universal Oppression.

I will suppose for once, that *David* was against Defensive Arms and Resistance in any case; and upon this supposition, let us hear his Judgment and Resolution, 1 *Sam.* 26. 15, 16. David *said unto* Abner, *Art not thou a valiant man? and who is like unto thee in* Israel? *Wherefore then hast thou not kept thy Lord the King? for there came one of the people in to destroy the King thy Lord. This thing is not good that thou hast done: As the Lord liveth, ye are worthy to die, because ye have not kept your Master the Lords Anointed.*

Abner might have replied to *David*, (if he had been taught by the Dr.) Sir, the King is in pursuit of you, when you are innocent; and that illegally, cruelly, causlesly, maliciously; and therefore tho' I must not resist, I may not assist, nor see your innocent blood shed. Take my Master, Lord, and King, and do what you will with him. Here I must desire the Dr. to reflect upon his Conscience in the fear of God. And I dare appeal to the Judgment of any moderate, conscientious, and learned Papist, or to the Judgment of any indifferent man in the World, if our Doctrine be not as honest as this. In this case Non-Assistance is as bad as Resistance; for the Prince must certainly, infallibly, and inevitably fall into the hands of his Adversaries, with this aggravation, That those he trusted deceived him.

To this purpose we may consider that distinction of the Efficient Cause mentioned by the School-men. It is either, 1. Physical Or, 2. Moral. The Physical Cause is that which hath a real influx towards the Effect, or that which truly, and of it self contributes to the Being of the Effect. The Moral Cause is that, which tho' it doth not really operate in producing the Effect, yet it is such (*in ordine Moris*) in order to Manners, as they say, as if it really conferred Being to the Effect; and that because the Effect that follows is no less imputable to it, than if it had produced the Effect by a real influx; such are causes consulting, commanding, and not hindering, when they ought to hinder. But I have sufficiently lashed this Doctrine elsewhere.

As for the rest of the Book, it is either what we grant, or what hath been already answered, or contains the Dr's. Arguments to perswade the Clergy, that have not taken the Oaths. And I see no reason why the Arguments should not prevail with them, if they will lay aside prejudice.

judice. But I believe the Dr. may Preach Paſſive Obedience, and Non-Reſiſtance upon *Rom.* 13. long enough, before he will gain one rational and conſidering man. For the Male-adminiſtration of the late unhappy King, and the Tyranny, Pride, and Inſolence of the Jeſuits, inſtead of frighting them out of their ſenſes, have frighted the Commons of *England* into their ſenſes, that they will rather believe they merit Salvation (if the Proteſtant Faith allowed it) than that they are guilty of that Reſiſtance, which, the Apoſtle ſaith, ſhall receive Damnation, for joyning with the Prince of *Orange*, and his Confederates, in this Revolution.

Wherefore I ſhall conclude with theſe three Propoſitions.

1. In our Caſe Defenſive Arms were lawful.

2. King *William* and Queen *Mary*, with their true Friends, can be juſtified no other way.

3. This Doctrine, as I have explained it, is neither contrary to the Church of *England*, nor more prejudicial or dangerous to Monarchy, than any other Principle; as will appear, I hope, to any, who will impartially conſider what I have written in a Treatiſe called *Conſcience Satisfied in a Cordial and Loyal Submitting to the preſent Government of King* William *and Queen* Mary; and in another ſmall Diſcourſe, in Anſwer to the Hiſtory of Paſſive Obedience; and in a Faſt Sermon on *Joſh.* 5. 13. *Art thou for us, or for our Adverſaries?* And I think that the Thankſgiving-days, and the Faſting-days, and the Collects, and Prayers read, and the laying *Amen* by all the Members of every Congregation, is a Juſtification of what hath been done in this Revolution, unleſs men are groſs Hypocrites, and honour God with their mouths, without their hearts.

And whatever ſome late Biſhops, and Governours of the Church have done, I am ſure the firſt Bleſſed Reformers honoured all Proteſtant Churches as Siſters, and their Divines and Miniſters as Brethren. I know not why *Luther*, and *Calvin*, and *Arminius* (tho' they differ in ſome Opinions) ſhould not all ſtill be honoured as faithful Servants of Chriſt. And here I ſhall produce a few of our Divines, moſt famous, who ſpeak honourably of them; as all men, that hate Faction in the Church ought to do.

The Reverend Biſhop *Jewel* (Reply to *Hard. A. Art.* 2. *Diviſ.* 6.) juſtifies *Luther* as a godly man, and accuſeth *Harding* of Slander. And (*Diviſ.* 7) he calls *Melanthon* and *Bucer*, godly learned men. And he calls *Peter Martyr*, a moſt worthy and learned Father. (*A.* to *Hardings* Preface.) And *Harding* commends his Modeſty. And ſurely if Paſſive Obedience had been the Doctrine of thoſe days, and eſteemed (as it hath been of late) Rebellion to oppoſe it, the ever Renowned *Hooker* (Preface to Eccl. Pol.) would not have honoured *Calvin* with this *Elogium*; For my own part, I think him (that is, *Calvin*) incomparably the wiſeſt man that ever the French Church did enjoy, ſince the hour it enjoyed him. The Divines of the Church of *England* are not wont thus to commend

Authors

Authors guilty of Hereſie, or Schiſm, or Sedition, or Rebellion. And Dr. *Bilſon* (True difference between Chriſtian Subjection, and unchriſtian Rebellion, p. 3. pag. 264.) ſaith, *Calvin* is ſo well known to thoſe that be Learned or Wiſe, for his great pains and labours in the Church of God, that a few ſnarling Fryars cannot impeach his Name. And Dr. *Whitgift* againſt the Puritan *T. C.* every where honours *Bullinger*, *Caſtius*, and more eſpecially *Zuinglius*: And yet all theſe juſtified Defenſive Arms in ſome caſe. Now who are the Innovators? they that follow the firſt Doctors of our Church, or they that have embraced other new and unheard of Principles in Government? I leave the works of our Forefathers to be Judges.

But here it is objected by ſome weak and factious ſpirits, that our Convention (or Parliament) have done as bad to the late King, as the Rump Parliament, ſo called, *O. C.* and the Army of Sectaries did to King *Charles* the Firſt: And therefore if we are juſtifiable, they are juſtifiable, and conſequently *Jan.* 30. ought not to be kept as a day of Humiliation and Faſting.

For this, let the Reader conſider what the Dr. ſaith, *p.* 46, 47, *&c.* Or let him take this Anſwer. Our Cauſe and theirs differ as far as Heaven and Hell, or Good and Bad, Murder and Self-defence. I will not ſay that there were no Corruptions in Government, nor no Innovations brought into the Church: Neither will I diſpute the Reaſonableneſs of the War between the King, and Parliament in the beginning. But ſuppoſing that the Parliament had ſufficient Cauſe to defend themſelves: Yet,

1. King *Charles* the Firſt had given full ſatisfaction to the Two Houſes of Parliament, and the Biſhops, and the Common Prayer were Eſtabliſhed by Law: And all know that it was the National Worſhip, as it is now, and cannot be abrogated, or altered, but by King, Lords, and Commons: But *O. C.* deſtroyed the Houſe of Lords, and the Book of Common Prayer by force, and by the Sword.

2. King *Charles* the Firſt was a profeſſed Proteſtant, and all his Officers and Miniſters in Church and State were ſuch as the Law allowed: But the Late King was a profeſſed Papiſt, and put Papiſts in Places of Truſt againſt Law, and turned out all the beſt Proteſtants for no reaſon, but only becauſe they oppoſed the Jeſuits and Arbitrary Power.

3. King *Charles* the Firſt, and the Parliament had concluded upon a Settlement to the ſatisfaction of all ſober and wiſe Men in the Kingdom; but *O. C.* and his Army of Sectaries with force turned about a hundred Members out of Parliament, and kept them Priſoners againſt Law and Juſtice.

4. *O. C.* and the Sectaries Ruled the Nation by the Sword in time of Peace, contrary to all Law, and Executed many of the moſt Zealous Proteſtants: But King *William* defends all Proteſtants according to Law.

5. They, like Cruel Tyrants and Uſurpers, deſtroyed the whole Frame

Frame of Government, Murdered the King, and Baniſhed all the Royal Family. As there are ſome at this day, who are ſo vain and ſottiſh as to deſire a Common-wealth, and to Root out the Biſhops, and Common Prayer, and ſo bring confuſion into Church and State. As if there were no difference between the Reformation of Abuſes, and deſtroying that which is good and excellent. We ſay that this Faction in a Nation is to be oppoſed as well as the Tyranny and Illegal Proceedings of the Papiſts: For both are deſtructive of our Laws, and Eſtabliſhed Religion. It is true our preſent Buſineſs is againſt the Abominations of the Church of *Rome*, and the Uſurpations of Popiſh Prieſts and Jeſuits: But we alſo abhor all thoſe who would Murder a Proteſtant King, and deſtroy our Liberties, and the Religion by Law Eſtabliſhed, and force us contrary to our Conſciences: But King *William* oppoſeth none but Papiſts, who would have deſtroyed us, and he continues our Parliament and our Laws, Liberties, and Religion, with all the Incouragements thereof.

6. King *William* was invited over by divers of the Nobility, and Gentry, to ſave us from Popery and Slavery, and was received with the univerſal Joy of Proteſtants: But *O. C.* and his Sectaries, who Barbarouſly and Impudently Murdered King *Charles* the Firſt, were cryed out againſt by all ſound Proteſtants, who adhered to the Laws of the Nation. So that that Rebellion and King *William*'s Actions, and thoſe that joined with him, differ as much, as Deſtroying a Nation, and Saving a Nation; as the greateſt Sin, and the greateſt Good.

Laſtly, Our Royal Martyr, King *Charles* the Firſt died in the Defence of the Laws, and Eſtabliſhed Religion: But the Late King Abdicated, or Deſerted, or at leaſt went out of the Kingdom, rather than he would Rule according to Law: And when he was gone to *France* the Chief of the Nobility and Gentry deſired the P. of *O.* to take the Government upon him, and to Summon a Convention; which Convention Elected him King, and the Princeſs Queen. The Late King fled, and Baniſhed himſelf, rather than he would do the Nation Juſtice, and when he was gone, the Convention (or Parliament) reſolved to keep him out. The P. of *O.* tho' a Soveraign Prince, and no way Subject to the Late King, did not Murder him, when he had him in his Power: But *O. C.* and the Sectaries of the Army Beheaded King *Charles* the Firſt, tho' he was Innocent, and a Prince of moſt Excellent Virtues, and of Ever Bleſſed Memory.

Ob. *Solomon* ſaith, *Prov.* 24. 21, 22. *My Son, fear thou the Lord and the King, and meddle not with them that are given to change. For their calamity ſhall riſe ſuddenly, and who knoweth the ruin of them both?*

A. This Text doth not forbid the Change of Government in Abſolute neceſſity, when the Safety of the whole Kingdom requires it, and it is done Regularly, and for the Publick Good. But commands Obedience and Fear to the preſent Lawful King, and never to join with Changelings, who are reſtleſs under Government, and Lightly, Wantonly, Factiouſly,

ctiouſly, or Seditiouſly oppoſe what is preſent. It is not to be underſtood Morally, as if it were Abſolutely evil, and a Sin to change, when the whole Frame of Government is corrupt: But you muſt take it prudentially, that a wiſe Man, who fears God, ought not to Change that Form of Government under which he lives, unleſs in urgent neceſſity. But what if the King be given to Change? Then meddle not with Him. Keep the Fundamental Laws and Cuſtoms of your Countrey, and the true Religion by Law Eſtabliſhed. We ſay (ſaith a Learned Author) that if Power be given to the King by Law, yea, or to other Magiſtrates, tho' it be againſt Religion, we have no help but ſuffering, or flying, till we can be helped by Legal ways. But if when we have Laws for our Religion and Liberties, the King out of his own will, or ſeduced by others, ſhall in an Illegal way ſeek to deprive us of them, now we may defend our ſelves, and in this we reſiſt no Kingly Authority, but the Will of ſuch a Man.

Obj. *Exod.* 22. 28. *Thou ſhalt not revile the Gods, nor curſe the Ruler of thy People.*

A. This Text commands Obedience to the King, with all reverence in Heart, Tongue, and Action. But what is this to innocent and lawful Defence: Which St. *Thomas*, and other Schoolmen call *cum moderamine inculpatæ tutelæ.*

Obj. *Pſal.* 51. 4. *Againſt thee, thee only have I ſinned, and done this evil in thy ſight.*

A. The Confeſſion of *David* (ſaith a great Divine) is to be taken comparatively. He ſinned againſt God alone by way of Excellence; becauſe he could be puniſhed, condemned, and abſolved by God alone. But *David* ſinned alſo againſt thoſe, who were meer Subjects, as *Bathſheba*, *Uriah*, *Joab*, and *Nathan*, but not as a Tyrant, violating the whole State of the Commonwealth; but as a Sinner, left to his Luſt. Furthermore, no Man could judge of the Perſonal Fact of *David*, except God alone, which pertained not to the Subverſion of the Common-wealth. I ſay, the ſin of *David* was particular, which was not deſtructive to the whole Common-wealth. Beſides, *David* ſpeedily recanted, and repented of the evil. The ſenſe is, (ſaith *Calvin*, cited by the Author of the *Synopſis*) as if he ſhould ſay, I do not regard what Men think or ſpeak; if either they ſpare me, or extenuate the wickedneſs by flattery, or mitigate my grief with gentle Speeches; yet it is more than enough to me, that I perceive thee my Judge, that Conſcience draws me to thy Tribunal, &c. Other Expoſitors ſay, I have ſinned againſt thee only as a Judge and Avenger, becauſe I can fear puniſhment from thee only. For Kings are free from the Bonds of their offences, ſaith St. *Ambroſe*. *R. R.* ſaith, No Creature judgeth the King, but the bleſſed God; otherwiſe he would be King in Name, not in Deed. (G) The Kings ſin is not puniſhable. Which is all true of the Perſonal Crimes of Princes, or of ſuch Oppreſſions as are ſpeedily repented of.

Obj.

Obj. *Pſal.* 82. 6. *I have ſaid ye are Gods.*

A. This is true (ſaith one) of Inferiour Magiſtrates as well as Superiors, and yet none will ſay, but the Inferior may be reſiſted. Kings ſhould imitate God in Wiſdom, in Juſtice, in Mercy, *&c*, and defend, not oppreſs the Innocent. To tell a King thus becomes a Prieſt, much better than to delude him with an unaccountable and irreſiſtible Power.

Obj. *Prov.* 8. 15, 16. *By me Kings Reign, and Princes Decree Juſtice. By me Princes Rule, and Nobles, even all the Judges of the Earth.*

A. By, here, denotes the Principal cauſe, it doth not exclude the leſs Principal, or Inſtrumental, the Election of the People. As, *Pſal.* 18.29. *By thee* (that is, God) *I have run thro' a Troop*; or by thy help (ſaith *Synop.* out of *G.*) By me as King of Kings Kingdoms are conſtituted; and Perſons ſet over Kingdoms, either are given, or are depoſed according to *Dan.* 2.21. & 4.25, 31, 32. and by me they are preſerved, *&c.* Neither doth this forbid the People to defend themſelves againſt a Tyrant, or to Depoſe a Tyrant, but rather acknowledgeth them Inſtruments. This hinders not what St. *Thomas* ſaith, (2.2.*q.*10, *art.* 10.) Dominion and Prelacy were introduced by Humane Right. Becauſe God and Man both concur to Government: God is the firſt Cauſe, Man the ſecond. Whatſoever the ſecond Cauſe doth (ſaith *Forteſcue* out of an ancient Author, *c.* 3.) the ſame doth the firſt Cauſe by an higher and more excellent way or mean.

Obj. *Prov.* 30. 31. *A King againſt whom there is no riſing up.* And, *Eccleſ.* 8. 4. *Where the word of a King is, there is Power; and who may ſay unto him, What doſt thou?*

A. Theſe Texts ſpeak of a King Ruling according to the Cuſtoms and Laws of his Countrey, or not of Tyrants and Oppreſſors: Or, at leaſt, they forbid not ſelf-defence in caſe of Extremity. I may honour the King, and yet not ſuffer him to kill me, when I am innocent, and have ſerved Him faithfully, and when he ought by the Laws of God and Man to protect me. *Solomon*, *Prov.* 30. 31. ſpeaks of the glory and happineſs of a potent and invincible Prince: not of any Moral evil or unlawfulneſs in defending our ſelves againſt Illegal Courſes, Oppreſſion, and Tyranny of wicked Princes. Again, theſe Texts give a General Rule, being wholly ſilent in caſual exceptions; as in caſe of extream Male-Adminiſtration. The ſacred Writers exclude not certain Pacts, (ſaith a grave Divine) or Laws of Humane Creation, (or Conſtitution) by which the King is put into that Super-eminency. And the ſaying of *Optatus Milevitanus*, is either to be taken of Emperors or Abſolute Monarchs: or verily of Him, who reſtrains his Super-eminence within the Laws of Divine as well as Humane Conſtitution; for then in truth, There is none above the Emperor, but God alone, who made the Emperor. *Solomon* ſaith what may be done, not what may always be rightly done by a Prince. For afterwards, *v.* 9. he teacheth us that many abuſe their Power to Tyranny. *There is a time wherein one Man ruleth over another to his own hurt.* Therefore he doth not give the Magiſtrate leave to do

what he will. For the Power of Man is limited by the Word of God, and honeſt Laws. Becauſe it is written, *We muſt obey God rather than Man: and give to* Cæſar *the things that are* Cæſar's, *and to God the things that are Gods.* The ſecond verſe is not to be underſtood otherwiſe, *I counſel thee to keep the Kings commandment, and that in regard of the Oath of God.* As if he ſhould ſay, So obey the King, as rather to obey God, to whom we are all bound with greater Religion.

Obj. Eccl. 10. 20. *Curſe not the King, no not in thy thought; and curſe not the rich in thy bed-chamber; for a Bird of the Air ſhall carry the voice, and that which hath wings ſhall tell the matter.*

A. Solomon prohibits reviling, or ſlighting the Kings perſon, or ſpeaking evil of the King, either for natural, or moral, perſonal defects, and vices. And he cautions us againſt wrath for a little Oppreſſion; becauſe a King may eaſily be revenged on us, and ruine us: But he forbids not ſelf-defence in caſe of Univerſal Oppreſſion. If thou art wiſe and skilful, deſpiſe not a young or a fooliſh King, by mocking his Majeſty; by proud ſlandering his Government; by contemning and reproaching his Statutes and Deeds; but (as much as the matter and truth will bear) ſpeak thou honourably of him, and think the beſt, and interpret well actions that are doubtful (ſaith ſome Author.) For it is wiſdom as well as duty to reverence the Kings Perſon and Office, and conceal ſmall miſcarriages.

Obj. St. *Matth.* 22. 21. Read the Context, *v.* 15. *Then went the Phariſees, and took counſel how they might intangle him in his talk. And they ſent out unto him their Diſciples, with the Herodians, ſaying, Maſter, we know that thou art true, and teacheſt the way of God in truth, neither careſt thou for any man, for thou regardeſt not the perſon of men: Tell us therefore, what thinkeſt thou? Is it lawful to give Tribute unto* Cæſar, *or not? But Jeſus perceived their wickedneſs, and ſaid, Why tempt ye me, ye Hypocrites? Shew me the Tribute-money; and they brought unto him a penny. And he ſaid unto them, Whoſe is this Image and Superſcription? They ſay unto him,* Cæſars. *Then ſaith he unto them, Render therefore unto* Cæſar *the things which are* Cæſars; *and unto God the things that are Gods. When they had heard theſe words, they marvelled, and left him, and went their way.*

A. It is moſt certain that Tribute is to be paid to our Governours. The Herodians were ſent to intangle him in his talk: And they propounded this Queſtion concerning *Cæſar*, the Roman Emperor's Tribute. To which our Saviour anſwers, that they ought to render to *Cæſar* the things that are *Cæſars*. So that by Chriſts command all Subjects muſt willingly and chearfully, and for Conſcience ſake render honour, tribute, cuſtom, ſubjection, and obedience to the Higher Powers, which are ordained of God. But what is this to the Defenſive Arms againſt Tyranny and Oppreſſion? The Jews had promiſed Obedience to the Romans, and to *Cæſar*. Now what we promiſe, (Synop. out of G.) tho' forced by neceſſity of War, binds us faſt; for unleſs it were ſo, the whole ſanction of a Cove-

Covenant would periſh. Beſides Poſſeſſion of a long time, which to endeavour to move (or change) is always unjuſt in publick Affairs. Chriſt, and his Apoſtles, and the Primitive Chriſtians hearkened to no Innovations under what ſpecious pretences ſoever, but performed Faith, Allegiance, and Obedience to the Emperor. But let any man prove that theſe Emperors did not rule the Jews according to their Promiſe and Covenant, and known Laws and Cuſtoms; or that our Saviour forbids defending our Lives, Liberties, or Properties, if invaded contrary to Law, Cuſtom, or Covenant. Again, it follows not, that if Chriſt doth not here diſpute *Cæſars* Title, that he never did, nor that his Diſciples never ſatiſfied themſelves. I am ſure the Scribes and Phariſees, and the multitude cryed out, when our Saviour was accuſed, *We have no King but* Cæſar; a plain acknowledgment of *Cæſars* Title, Power and Authority.

Obj. 1 *Tim.* 2. 1,2,3. *I exhort therefore that firſt of all, ſupplications, prayers, interceſſions, and giving of thanks be made for all men; for Kings, and for all that are in Authority, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life, in all godlineſs and honeſty; for this is good and acceptable in the ſight of God our Saviour.*

A. This is alſo ſpoken of Governours indefinitely, and of ſuch who would rule according to the Cuſtoms and Laws of their Countries: Not of Tyrants who would Subvert National Laws and Cuſtoms without cauſe. And tho' there was great Confuſions in the *Roman* Empire about the Throne, ſometimes, yet ſtill the Emperor promiſed to Rule according to Laws and Cuſtoms received. And ſurely no Man can prove that Paſſive Obedience was owned in thoſe days, if the Emperor commanded Illegally: Nor was their Hereditary Succeſſion in the Empire. The wickedneſs of Man, cannot deſtroy the Inſtitution of God. But Magiſtrates, Kings, Emperors are conſtituted of God. And Chriſtian Religion doth not overthrow the Political Government of Infidels and Heathens. Therefore we muſt pray for all, Perſecutors, and Idolaters.

Obj. *Tit.* 3. 1. *Put them in mind to be ſubject to Principalities and Powers, to obey Magiſtrates.*

A. All theſe Texts command what no rational Man, much leſs Chriſtian denieth, ought to be given to our Governors: But they prohibit not Defenſive Arms in caſe of Univerſal Oppreſſion.

Obj. 1 St. *Pet.* 13, 14, 17. *Submit your ſelves to every Ordinance of Man for the Lords ſake, whether it be to the King as Supream, or unto Governours, as unto them that are ſent by him for the puniſhment of evil doers, and for the praiſe of them that do well. Fear God. Honour the King.*

A. The Apoſtle ſpeaks indefinitely of Governors, and of Obedience to them; but he ſtates no particular Caſe. When this Epiſtle was written, (*Synop.* out of G.) I think that *Claudius*, or *Nero*, was Emperor. Therefore we muſt obey Infidels, and evil Princes. But this prohibits not Self-defence, when Laws are violated. Tho' the Ordinance or Government in the manner of its Conſtitution be from Man, (ſaith a Learned Author) yet becauſe of

of the neceſſity of its Inſtitution, it is from God. Submit to it, tho' of Man, for the Lords ſake. For God is the primary Author. Obſerve Kings and Preſidents are an Humane Conſtitution or Ordinance, made by Men with common Conſent, by certain Laws, yet by the Command and Authority of God. So that I conclude with a great Stateſman, *As it was the Oppreſſion and Slavery under which we had been brought, that rendered His Majeſty's undertaking in coming into theſe Kingdoms with armed Force, in order to redeem them, both Honourable and Juſt: So it was the Hope of being delivered by Him from Miſery and Bondage, that incouraged us firſt to invite, and then to cooperate with Him in the Proſecution and Accompliſhment of His Glorious Deſign. It was the Invaſion upon our Laws that we complained of, and from which we deſired and indeavoured to be relieved*, &c.

Thus I have omitted no appearance of an Objection, and have given ſatisfaction to all, that will examine things impartially and conſciencioufly, in order to their ready and hearty Obedience to Their Majeſties, and the Preſervation of the Religion, Laws, and Liberties of this Kingdom.

I ſhall conclude all with a plain Exhortation both in reſpect of the King, and Subjects.

Firſt, For the King. Seeing His Majeſty hath received Power and Authority from God, it concerns him to Adminiſter Juſtice and Judgment. For Gods Eye is All-ſeeing, and he is Omnipreſent. *God ſtandeth in the Congregation of the Mighty: he judgeth among the Gods*, Pſal. 82. 1. It is a poor, weak, inferior thing, beneath the Spirit and Dignity of a Prince, to wrong the Innocent: But it is indeed Great and Godlike, to ſeek Judgment, and relieve the Oppreſſed. God hath Honoured Kings with his own Name and Titles, and they ſhould imitate Him in Wiſdom, Goodneſs, Juſtice, and Mercy. And as this tends to the Honour of God, and Happineſs of his Church, and the Proſperity of the Kingdom, ſo it gains the Love and Affection of Subjects, which is the only Ambition of Valiant, Wiſe, and Juſt Monarchs.

Secondly, For the Subject. Seeing Kings are by Gods Deſignation, Ordination, or Conſtitution, let every Subject humbly ſubmit. They derive their Right from the Higheſt Majeſty of Heaven and Earth. They are ſet over us by Gods approbation. And the God of *Iſrael*, who led his People by the hands of *Moſes* and *Aaron*, in all Ages hath ſubjected Mankind to ſome of his Viceroys on Earth. And they who are Enemies to them, are Enemies to God, and caſt off that ſweet and eaſie Yoke of Obedience, to which God would have all his ſubmit. This condemns all wilful Offenders, who diſobey Governours. They are in Gods ſtead, and to deſpiſe them, is to deſpiſe God himſelf. And as Subjects ought to yield Obedience to their Soveraigns (which I have Illuſtrated elſewhere) ſo they ought to be grateful for their Favour, Mercy, Clemency, and good Government. And in particular, they ought to be thankful to God, and the King, for the Mercies of this preſent time, even the Reviving of our Religion, Laws and Liberties.

FINIS.